DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 257 167 CS 504 948

AUTHOR	Parson, Donn W., Ed.
TITLE	American Forensics in Perspective. Papers from the National Conference on Forensics (2nd, Evanston, Illinois, September 12-15, 1984).
INSTITUTION	Speech Communication Association, Annandale, Va.
PUB DATE	Sep 84
NOTE	107p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Speech Communication Association, 5105 Backlick Rd., Annandale, VA 22003 ($9.95, prepaid, members, 10% discount).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Communication Skills; *Debate; Higher Education; *Persuasive Discourse; *Speech Communication; Speech Curriculum
IDENTIFIERS	*Forensic Science

ABSTRACT

Providing a record of the deliberations of the Second National Conference of Forensics is the function of this book, which is organized around the deliberations and results of each of the following nine work groups: (1) rationale for forensics, (2) ethics of forensics, (3) promotion and tenure standards, (4) strengthening educational goals, (5) strengthening and expanding programs, (6) interorganizational cooperation, (7) topic selection in debate, (8) summer institutes, and (9) individual events. Each chapter provides an introduction to the problems addressed by a particular work group. Where issues were in controversy, that disagreement is indicated. Following the introductory statements are resolutions adopted by the conference from each work group. A short statement of rationale or implementation follows each resolution. In some cases, the introductory essays contain statements from the position papers of work group members. Where that is not the case, the chapter contains a section with comments drawn from individual position papers. In some chapters, primarily those on rationale, ethics, and promotion and tenure, the product of the work group was a position paper adopted by the conference. The last chapter reflects the views of some administrators in the presentation to the conference by J. Thomas Goodnight. The appendix contains names of the members of the planning committee, work groups, administrators, and the reactor group. (EL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED257167

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

AMERICAN FORENSICS IN PERSPECTIVE

Papers from: The Second National Conference on Forensics

Editor: Donn W. Parson
University of Kansas

SPEECH COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION
Annandale, VA

CS 504 948

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
SCA

TO THE EDUCATIONA[illegible]RCES INFORMATION CENT[illegible]."

The Second National Conference on Forensics

September 1984

Northwestern University

Conference Director: George W. Ziegelmueller
Wayne State University

American Forensic Association President: Maridell Fryar
Midland Public Schools

Copyright 1984 by the Speech Communication Association

AMERICAN FORENSICS IN PERSPECTIVE

Donn W. Parson
Editor

PREFACE

Following the 1974 National Developmental Conference on Forensics, known as the Sedalia Conference, there appeared a book of its proceedings, *Forensics as Communication: The Argumentative Perspective,* adroitly edited by James McBath. The volume contained not only the resolutions passed by the Sedalia conferees, but also the statements of participants and research commissioned by the Conference. Given the patterns created by the first National Conference book, the task of editing the Second National Conference Proceedings was made infinitely easier. Since it offered a path to follow, there needed to be reasons for the roads not taken.

The Second Conference was organized differently than the Sedalia Conference. This time nine individual work groups exchanged information and drafted resolutions on individual aspects of forensics. These work groups included: (1) Rationale for Forensics, (2) Ethics of Forensics, (3) Promotion and Tenure, (4) Educational Goals, (5) Strengthening and Expanding Programs, (6) Interorganizational Cooperation, (7) Topic Area Selection, (8) Summer Institutes, (9) Individual Events. While some efforts of groups were overlapping, most concentrated on problems unique to their area of focus. For that reason, it seemed sensible to organize this book around the deliberations and results of each of the work groups.

There is one exception to this pattern. Considerable overlap in focus and product occurs between the group on Educational Goals and the group on Strengthening and Expanding Programs. For that reason, the efforts of both groups are combined in Chapter 5, Strengthening Educational Goals.

Each chapter provides an introduction to the problems addressed by the individual work groups. Where issues were in controversy, that disagreement is indicated. Following the introductory statements are resolutions adopted by the conference from each work group. A short statement of rationale or implementation follows each resolution. In some cases, the introductory essays contain statements from the position papers of work group members. Where that is not the case, the chapter contains a section with comments drawn from individual position papers. In some chapters, primarily those on rationale, ethics, and promotion and tenure, the product of the work group was a position paper adopted by the conference.

At the Sedalia Conference of 1974, several administrators were invited to provide their views of forensics. At the 1984 Conference a small group of administrators met separately to view forensics from that perspective. While no resolutions resulted, the spirit of the meeting is reflected in the presentation to the Conference by G. Thomas Goodnight, which is included in Chapter 10 of this volume.

The function of this book is to provide a record of the deliberations of the Second National Conference of Forensics. All resolutions are presented as passed by the assembly. Some editorial license has been used in the hope of increasing clarity of position. Occasionally resolutions have been moved from one group to another, where they more sensibly fit.

One of the tasks of an editor is to provide an appropriate title for the work. A number of suggestions were offered. "Random Thoughts" was discarded when an organizational scheme was discovered. "American Forensics in Transition" was considered because it caught the increasing diversity of interests in forensics. "Decisions for Forensics" was considered for we may be approaching the time when crucial decisions concerning the future of the activity must be squarely faced. The title, "American Forensics in Perspective" was chosen in part because our task was to reflect on the work of the first conference and its recommendations and also to project a view of the future course of American forensics. As one member observed, if there is anything that forensics needs in a time of fragmentation and innovation, it is most assuredly perspective.

I am indebted to a number of persons for help in preparing this volume. James McBath, Walter Ulrich, Craig Dudczak, David Zarefsky, Jack Rhodes, Robert Rowland, William Balthrop and John Murphy agreed to present the thinking of the work groups in introductory statements. Several provided other editorial suggestions. Jospeh Wenzel and David Zarefsky provided major revisions of sections on ethics and the rationale. George Ziegelmueller, the Conference Director, gave counsel through all aspects of producing this volume. I am also indebted to my wife, Andrea, who provided proofreading, grammatical suggestions, and patience. Despite all that good counsel, and the memory of E. B. White, for the paths not taken, the editor is alone responsible.

Donn W. Parson
University of Kansas

CONTENTS

PREFACE
Donn W. Parson III

I. AN AGENDA FOR FORENSICS
George Ziegelmueller 1

II. RATIONALE FOR FORENSICS
A. TOWARD A RATIONALE FOR FORENSICS
James H. McBath 5
B. STATEMENT OF RATIONALE FOR FORENSIC EDUCATION 9

III. THE ETHICS OF FORENSICS
A. THE ETHICS OF FORENSICS: AN OVERVIEW
Walter Ulrich 13
B. STATEMENT OF THE ETHICS OF FORENSICS 15
C. RESOLUTIONS 19
D. STATEMENTS FROM POSITION PAPERS 20

IV. PROMOTION AND TENURE STANDARDS
A. PROMOTION AND TENURE STANDARDS: AN AGENDA FOR DELIBERATION
Craig A. Dudczak and David Zarefsky 23
B. STATEMENT OF GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION OF FORENSIC EDUCATORS 27
C. RESOLUTIONS 30
D. STATEMENTS FROM POSITION PAPERS 31

V. STRENGTHENING EDUCATIONAL GOALS AND PROGRAMS
A. FORENSIC DIRECTORS AS PROFESSIONAL EDUCATORS
George Ziegelmueller and Donn W. Parson 37
B. RESOLUTIONS 40
C. STATEMENTS FROM POSITION PAPERS 46

VI. INTER-ORGANIZATIONAL COOPERATION
FORENSIC COOPERATION: THE PROSPECTS FOR HARMONY THROUGH DIVERSITY
Jack Rhodes 49

VII. TOPIC SELECTION IN DEBATE
A. TOPIC SELECTION: PROBLEMS AND POTENTIAL FOR IMPROVEMENT
Robert C. Rowland 53
B. RESOLUTIONS 56
C. STATEMENTS FROM POSITION PAPERS 58

CONTENTS (Continued)

VIII. SUMMER INSTITUTES
- A. ENHANCING SUMMER EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES
  V. William Balthrop 59
- B. RESOLUTIONS 64
- C. PERCEPTIONS OF HIGH SCHOOL INSTRUCTORS REGARDING PRACTICES AND EFFECTS OF HIGH SCHOOL DEBATE WORKSHOPS
  Edward A. Hinck and Shelly L. Schaefer 68

IX. INDIVIDUAL EVENTS
- A. ORDER AND DIVERSITY: THE SEARCH FOR JUDGING STANDARDS IN INDIVIDUAL EVENTS
  John Murphy 87
- B. RESOLUTIONS 90
- C. COMMENTS FROM POSITION PAPERS 92

X. A VIEW FROM ADMINISTRATORS
SCHOLARSHIP AND THE FORENSIC COMMUNITY
G. Thomas Goodnight 95

APPENDIX 99

Chapter I
An Agenda for Forensics

George Ziegelmueller

In September of 1974 a selected group of forensics educators met in the Sedalia Retreat House in the mountains near Denver, Colorado. The purpose of this meeting was to examine the programs and goals of forensic education in the United States and to chart new directions for forensic instruction. That meeting at Sedalia, known as the National Developmental Conference on Forensics, was more than two years in planning and the recommendations of that conference were to have a profound effect upon forensics instruction for years to come.

By its nature a developmental conference cannot legislate change. It can only seek to influence through its reasoned discourse. Some of the changes which occurred in American forensics following the first Developmental Conference probably would have taken place without the impetus of the Conference. But the Conference undoubtedly provided a greater urgency to these changes and helped to assure a wider audience for their acceptance. Other changes were clearly the direct outgrowth of the Conference. Interaction which occurred at Sedalia stimulated new ideas and solidified new relationships, and in this way brought about new directions.

Two of the major directions suggested by the Developmental Conference were calls for greater professionalism among forensics teachers and for greater pluralism and openness within the activity itself. Of the four main task groups of the Sedalia Conference, two were devoted to professional concerns: "Research and Scholarship," and "Professional Preparation, Status, and Rewards." By including former debate coaches and argumentation scholars in the composition of the Conference, the Planning Committee helped to assure a broader professional view of forensics. In the ten years since the Conference, there has been a renewed interest among forensics professionals in argumentation theory and research. The *Journal of the American Forensic Association* has devoted increasing amounts of space to articles of broad theoretical concerns, and the emergence of the University of Utah's Summer Conferences on Argumentation has continued to draw active debate coaches and argumentation teachers more closely together in their scholarly interests and concerns.

The two remaining task groups of the first Developmental Conference were concerned with "Future Goals and Roles" and "Theory and Practice," Although many specific resolutions were produced by these task groups, the central thrust of these recommendations was to call for a broader conceptualization of forensic activities and for the development of ways to encourage wider participation by all sexes, races and classes. The call for a broader conceptualization resulted partly from a recognition of legitimate disagreements over what the nature of forensics ought to be and partly from a belief that more diversified activities would attract more students to forensics. In the ten years since Sedalia, diversity has become the greatest characteristic of the American forensics scene. In addition to traditional or NDT debate, there is now the value-oriented debate of the Cross Examination Debate Association and the two-person format of Lincoln-Douglas debate. Individual Events, which had all but disappeared from the national forensic scene at the time of Sedalia, has had an enormous resurgence at the college level and now has not one, but two different national championship tournaments.

PLANNING FOR THE SECOND DEVELOPMENTAL CONFERENCE

At the conclusion of the Sedalia conference a resolution was approved calling for the establishment of a second developmental conference within ten years. That resolution and the emergence of new problems within the forensic profession served as the impetus for a second National Developmental Conference on Forensics.

In the summer of 1983 Jack Rhodes, the president of the American Forensic Association, began to assemble a planning committee to develop a second Forensics Conference. In establishing the Planning Committee, President Rhodes sought to include representatives from the various interest groups of the increasingly fragmented forensics community. The committee held its first meeting in November 1983 in conjuction with the Speech Communication Association convention.

Initially only two constraints were placed upon the work of the committee: 1) the conference was to be open to all members of the forensic community, and 2) the conference was to convene within a year. The request for an open conference was in marked contrast to the Sedalia conference which was limited to a relatively small group of representatives in the profession. The idea of an open conference was precipitated by a desire to avoid the appearance of elitism in the selection of conference personnel and by the need to assure representation of all interest groups. The request to hold the conference in 1984 was dictated both by a desire to conform to the time frame established for the second conference by the Sedalia conferees and by a sense of urgency created by fragmentation and division within the forensic community.

These two initial guidelines to the Planning Committee conditioned many subsequent planning decisions. The committee quickly decided that the second Developmental Conference should focus on forensic activity programs *per se* and should not specifically be concerned with matters of scholarship in argumentation. This decision was motivated by a desire to create a more homogenous group of participants. There was also considerable feeling that the scholarly issues in the area of argumentation were being adequately addressed in other forums, particularly the Summer Argumentation Conferences. The one year time frame meant that it was necessary to proceed with detailed planning of the Conference without an adequate knowledge of available financial support. In order to maximize planning time and to minimize interference with regularly scheduled forensic events, the Conference was scheduled for September, 1984.

During the initial phase of its work, the Planning Committee received financial support from a wide variety of forensic organizations, including: American Forensic Association, Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha, National Forensic Association, Phi Rho Pi, Cross Examination Debate Association, Illinois Speech & Theater Association, Alan Nichols Memorial Fund, Pi Kappa Delta, Northern California Forensic Association, Speech Communication Association—Forensic Division.

After careful examination of the current forensics scene, the Planning Committee decided that the conference should address itself to nine major problem areas. There was strong and uniform consensus that the most critical issue in the field of forensics was the one of fragmentation of forensic organizations. In addition to this broad overriding issue, there were three specific areas where problems could be clearly identified. These concerned the areas of summer institutes, evaluating individual events, and selection of debate topics. The Planning Committee also felt it was desirable to give continuing attention to the questions of how to increase the educational value of forensics and of how to strengthen and expand forensic programs. Finally, the Planning Committee wished to utilize the expertise of Conference participants to help in the development of some major professional statements. The desired professional documents were to concern a rationale for forensics, a statement of the ethics of forensics, and a statement on standards of promotion, tenure, and merit.

During the winter and spring of 1984, announcements of the National Developmental Conference were widely circulated, and members of the forensics profession were urged to register for the Conference. In May 1984 the Exxon Education Foundation provided a grant to support the Developmental project. This grant made it possible to carry the Conference forward in ways consistent with the original conception of the Planning Committee.

Individuals who registered for the Conference were asked to designate their desire to be part of either a reactor group or a work group. This two-tiered system of participation was devised as a means of adjusting to the circumstances created by unrestricted registration. The goal was to create a situation in which all Conference participants would have an opportunity to have some input into the formulation of resolutions, while at the same time allowing for more in-depth interaction among smaller, more manageable groups of participants.

Work group members would be assigned to specific problem areas throughout the Conference and would be asked to prepare position papers prior to the Conference. Reactor group members would be allowed to move between work groups and would not be required to undertake any specific preparation prior to the Conference. Because of the large number of people interested in work group assignments, the Planning Committee ultimately had to select work group participants from among those registered. The primary criterion in selecting work group participants was representativeness.

During the summer work group members prepared position papers which were addressed to the special interests of their assigned work groups. These papers were circulated among the other members of the assigned group. Two chairpersons were named for each work group. Their task was to integrate the ideas articulated in the position papers and to prepare a draft of resolutions for their work group to consider. The chairpersons' statement was distributed to all members of the work group two weeks before the Conference and served as an initial basis for the work group's deliberations.

THE CONFERENCE MEETING

The National Developmental Conference on Forensics convened in Evanston, Illinois, on September 12 through 15, 1984. On the evening prior to the official opening of the Conference, the Conference Director met with the chairpersons of each of the work groups to discuss the preliminary work of the committee and to try to provide clearer focus and direction for the work group's further deliberations.

Throughout the day of September 12 the nine work groups met in individual sessions to discuss and debate the issues relevant to their designated tasks. By that evening each work group had prepared a tentative working document.

The reactor group members arrived on the evening of the first day of the Conference and were oriented regarding their role. The reactor group members were divided into four sub-groups, and on the second day of the Conference, each of these four reactor groups interacted with the work groups. The purpose of this interaction was to provide feedback to and evaluation of the work groups' initial efforts. Each work group received reaction from at least two different reactor groups. After meeting with the reactor groups, the work groups re-drafted their resolutions and/or position papers. While the work groups were finishing their assigned tasks, reactor group members were free to arrange action caucuses for the purpose of preparing resolutions in addition to those being proposed by the work groups. Three such action caucuses were convened.

On the morning of the third day of the Conference, printed copies of the work group resolutions and position papers, action caucus resolutions and individual resolutions were distributed to all registered members of the Conference. After studying all of the proposed materials, the Conference participants were asked to indicate on a written ballot which of the resolutions and documents they were willing to approve without floor debate. Those resolutions which received the written support of 90 per cent or more of the Conference participants were automatically approved by the Conference. Resolutions which lacked 90 per cent support were placed on the agenda of the parliamentary assembly.

On the afternoon of the third day and on the morning and afternoon of the fourth day of the Conference, a parliamentary assembly was held to discuss and vote upon the more controversial issues of the Conference. Each participant in the Conference, whether work group or reactor group member, had one vote in the assembly. Although the amount of time for debating any given resolution was strictly limited, lively and full discussion of the issues occurred.

THE OUTCOME OF THE CONFERENCE

The final report of the 1984 Developmental Conference on Forensics is presented in the following pages. It represents the thoughful effort of 125 dedicated teachers of forensics. The statements and resolutions generated by the Conference are intended to establish standards for improving instruction in debate and individual events and for creating a more cooperative and challenging environment for the activity. Some of the changes proposed will require action by professional organizations and by departmental or university administrators. Other changes can only be implemented through individual action. It is hoped that the readers of this volume will be challenged by the ideas of the Conference participants and that they will seek in their own teaching and administration of forensic programs to utilize many of the suggestions of the Conference.

When the 125 participants arrived in Evanston, many of them were strangers. Although most were acquainted with one another's names, many had never had the opportunity for serious interaction with each other. The interchange which occurred at the Conference allowed the participants to become better acquainted with other professionals, many of whom had different perspectives and different special interests. Such acquaintanceship not only produced new friendships but new understanding as well. As you read this volume and share in the ideas and arguments of the Conference, it is hoped that your understanding and appreciation for the totality of forensics will be enhanced.

Chapter II
Rationale for Forensics

A. *Toward A Rationale for Forensics*

James H. McBath

The charge to develop a justification for one's academic program understandably draws a mixed reaction. Some will assert that the benefits are so self-evident as to make justification superfluous. A few may even resist the call to professional introspection. Most educators, however, will be drawn to the challenge of taking stock of their profession, assessing its trends and potential. Sometimes activities, like institutions, are simply the sum of historical accidents that have happened to them. Like the sand dunes in the desert, they are shaped by influences, but not by purposes or design. Yet justification requires that we are clear about the goals and shape of forensics education. Indeed, both planning and development—themes of the 1984 conference—must begin with a systematic inventory of assets, those singular characteristics on which improvement can be based. When the distinguished historian Allan Nevins wrote a book about the future of his profession, he titled the opening chapter, "A Proud Word for History." In a similar spirit the work group on Rationale approached its commission.

DEFINING FORENSICS

The framing of a Rationale must proceed from a common understanding of "forensics." Often used as an umbrella term covering various competitive speech specialties, conferees found it necessary to seek a broader meaning for forensics. To be sure, it is tempting to define forensics by the activities it usually includes. But such a conception is untrustworthy. As activities are added or subtracted, the definition expands or contracts. Moverover, forensics at one school would not be the same as forensics at another school that sponsors different activites. An activities-oriented definition of forensics is not a definition at all; it is a description of program characteristics. A durable rationale is built upon the substance of forensics rather than on its forms.

The fundamental nature of forensics was felt to be best expressed by this statement: *Forensics is an educational activity primarily concerned with using an argumentative perspective in examining problems and communicating with people.* An argumentative perspective on communication involves the study of reason giving by people as justification for acts, beliefs, attitudes, and values. Such a conception views forensics as an expression of scholarship and forensics activities as laboratories within which the results of student scholarship are evaluated. The substance of forensics is paramount.

Almost from the outset, the work group agreed that the element of competition is indispensable to forensics. Indeed, the terms frequently are joined—forensics competition—to suggest the contest of ideas, values, and arguments that marks forensics. The knowledge that contestants will have the products of their labors compared for the purpose of a judgment motivates them to do their best. Robert Rosenthal offered a succinct statement of the competitive principle:

> The stimulus of competition is a motivation for excellence in performance. Competition provides feedback concerning educational performance, much as a grade is an indication of academic achievement. Indeed, it is the competitive nature of forensics which makes it a unique learning experience. To deny competition is to deny a core concept of the activity. We must view competition in a positive perceptual frame throughout this report.

Just as competition is inherent in forensics, so is communication. Communication is integral to forensics. Abilities in communication, the conferees agreed, are necessary for argument to function effectively. Moreover, an important outcome of forensics education is improvement in communicative abilities. "Forensics experience," said William Harpine, "provides training and practice in the skills that constitute effective public communication." As will be seen later, the centrality of communication to forensics is reflected in the committee's thought and formulations.

Members of the work group on Rationale were confronted with several persistent interconnected questions whose eventual resolution seemed desirable: What is the common characteristic of all forensics programs? What is the unique contribution of forensics programs? Are we ascribing outcomes to ideal programs rather than to programs as they are?

We were drawn to the conclusion that *forensics is a communication-centered experience in scholarship in which one's ideas and arguments are subjected to the judgment of others.* Few, if any, academic enterprises place such intense demands upon participants for preparation, practice, confrontation, and critical judgment. Former participants often reflect that competitive forensics, especially debate, was their most intellectually challenging educational activity.[1] The opinion is widely held; it by no means is limited to members of programs with regional or national acclaim. Indeed, conferees were hard pressed to name any program as exemplary in terms of size, scope, leadership, and resources. The "ideal" was viewed as a goal to be pursued rather than as a precondition for beneficial outcomes.

USING FORENSICS

The early part of the deliberations was devoted to a canvas of the advantages of forensics to various constituencies—students, administrators, colleagues. The paragraphs that follow suggest the variety of views expessed by members of the work group.

Students. Forensics, as does any educational enterprise, exists for the benefit of students. The group believed that all other outcomes were secondary to the contribution made to students. As a learning experience, forensics was felt to hold unlimited potential for individual undergradutate development.

—Forensics offers students an opportunity to develop skills that are prized by society. That forensics graduates occupy significant positions in the life of the nation is important information for students planning their own programs.

—Forensics provides useful career preparation. The ability to think clearly and to communicate ideas effectively influences career success. For professions such as law, education, politics, religion, broadcasting, and the like, forensics can provide specific preparation.

—Forensics is diversified in its scope, appealing to students with different goals and interests.

—Forensics provides students with an opportunity to develop social skills, including experiences in teamwork and group membership. Students can develop realistic attitudes toward competition.

—Forensics enables students to clarify their personal and social values through confrontation with the value judgments of others.

—Forensics provides students an enriched educational offering. A good forensics program becomes a kind of ongoing honors course for academically talented students.

Administrators. Educational decision makers, concerned with academic substance no less than public image, provide indispensable institutional support for forensics. A crucial constituency, their goals may coincide with those of the forensics program in a number of ways.

---

[1] The impact of the debate experience is illuminated in a study of participants in the National Debate Tournament. See Ronald J. Matlon and Lucy M. Keele, "A Survey of Participants in the National Debate Torunament," *Journal of the American Forensic Association,* 20 (Spring 1984), 194-205. That "public speaking skills are paramount" was a major implication of the study.

—Forensics is a rigorous educational activity. The skills taught are those valued by those who view critical thinking and inquiry as central to the purposes of higher education. The documentation of this shared objective later was embedded in the final Statement of Rationale.

—A forensics program is inherently interdisciplinary, capable of serving students regardless of major. Funding for university-wide programs normally are outside the traditional departmental competition for resources.

—With renewed awareness of the importance of higher education, an active forensics program can serve an informing function for the institution. Besides enhancing goodwill, it can serve as a persuasive recruiting function since it involves student-to-student contact.

—Administrators can identify with forensics honor societies in a way not possible with clubs or student organizations. Most administrators are familiar with the concept of honor societies that recognize academic excellence.

—Institutions regularly compete in a wide variety of activities. Forensics provides competition on an intellectual level, a type that is compatible with the mission of higher education.

Midway in our sessions the members heard a review by Thomas Miller of findings of several recent commissions studying American education. All of the commissions endorsed as basic the skills that are emphasized in forensics. The work group found it noteworthy that inquiries into the substance of education invariably single out the forensics skills. Derek Bok, when he was President of Harvard, summarized the universal finding:

> There are certain intellectual skills and habits of thought that are so fundamental that they will serve students well in almost any problem or career in which they happen to engage. What are these intellectual skills? The most obvious is the ability to communicate orally and in writing with clarity and style. Equally important is the capacity for careful analysis—the ability to identify issues in a complex problem, collect the relevant information, marshall the pertinent arguments on every side of the question, test every contention and eliminate those that rest on faulty reasoning, and arrive at conclusions soundly related to the available data and arguments.[2]

The statement, although it was not so intended, could stand as the preamble to a volume in forensics. The point should be re-emphasized: forensics has an essential linkage with liberal education in that its subject matter and skills are generative. That is, they can be applied to other subjects and tasks. Generative studies, besides their intrinsic worth, assist students in unlocking other knowledge and in adapting more readily to their broader roles in society.

Academic Colleagues. Far and away the most common and preferred locale for forensics programs is the department of speech communication. Occasionally one hears about a program housed in some other department or accommodated *pro tem* by a dean of students but these are the exceptions.[3] Programs enjoying continuity and prestige usually are linked to the communication tradition in their institutions.

—Forensics shares the intellectual concerns and pedagogical goals of the field of speech communication. Research, analysis, and effective expression are central to the mission of communication study as well as to forensics education.

—Forensics is a proven recruiting tool. Many graduates first learned about speech communication through their participation in forensics. A survey of the leadership of our field reveals that a significant proportion—in fact, nearly all SCA presidents of the past ten years—participated in forensics.

---

[2] "On the Purposes of Undergraduate Education," *Daedalus,* 103 (Fall 1974), 163-64.

[3] At one institution, the chairman of the philosophy department became director of forensics: "Formal debate is proving to be a very effective educational instrument for teaching in the normative areas of philosophy—logic, ethics, and theory of knowledge." See Henry L. Ruf, "Teaching Philosophy and Debate." *Speaker and Gavel,* 17 (Summer 1980), 162-170.

—Forensics participants, tournaments, and organizations are potential resources for research. Scholars seeking new settings and populations for study would find forensics relatively unexamined in communication research.

—Forensics students often are among the ablest members of other classes. Their skills in research, analysis, and presentation transfer well within the educational environment.

—Course offerings and activities in forensics provide a cantilevering support for other coursework in a speech or language arts curriculum.

—Forensics offers preparation for advanced study in a number of fields, including speech communication.[4] Forensic activities provide positive educational experiences for students with diverse goals and and career objectives.

Forensics Community. To make the case for forensics more compelling, said Darrell Scott, "we need to better communicate to ourselves how our justifications serve or fail to serve the justifications we have advanced." He added: "Rather than starting with forensics and reworking our justifications, I would like to start with our justifications and rework forensics." The nature of tournament debate was a case in point. Only the knowledge that another work group was considering this question prevented our group from addressing problems arising from tournaments. For example, commenting on the "tournament ritual," Brenda Logue observed:

> There is so much the forensics educator does not know about the tournament setting. What is the optimum tournament participation for any event? What are the positive and negative effects of tournament participation? Compared to the home practice situtation, what more is gained educationally in the tournament rounds? What other educational formats would enhance refutational, communicative, and analytical skills?

The first Developmental Conference, concluding that "tournament debate should be an enterprise in the comparative communication of arguments," noted that debate is not an exercise in the rapid recitation of bits of evidence, erroneously known as "information processing." Sedalia conferees condemned such practices as the presentation of material at a rate too fast for most listeners to comprehend, the tactic of deliberately presenting more pieces of information or minor points than opponents can absorb, the use of verbal shorthand that obfuscates the clarity of argument; the infrequency of explanations among evidence, inferences, and conclusions; and the relative rarity of discussions of value assumptions. It is noteworthy that the volume reporting the conference was entitled *Forensics As Communication*. Not as logic, or evidence, or gamesmanship, and certainly not as information processing—but as communication. Now, ten years later, the Evanston conferees reaffirmed the primacy of communication in forensics, sharply criticizing tournament practices that subvert the essential character of the activity.

Ultimately, of course, all educational programs and fields vie for a measure of understanding in the public mind. Educators need no reminder of the difficulty of this task. But there can be no gainsaying the desirability of informing all who will listen about the nature of forensics and the skills and habits of thought they develop. Consider, for example, a statement offered by Edward Hinck that explores the intellectual processes involved in creating and communicating arguments:

> Creating an argument is the most complex cognitive act a student can engage in. To create an argument, students are require to research issues (which requires knowledge of how to use the library), organize data, analyze the data, synthesize different kinds of data, and evaluate information with respect to the quality of conclusions it may point to. To form an argument after researching, organizing, analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating, students must understand how to reason, must be able to recognize and critique different methods of reasoning, and must

---

[4] Addressing conferees, Thomas Goodnight identified forensics with the scholarly tradition of rhetoric and public address.

> have an understanding of argumentation theory—the logic of decision making. The successful communication of arguments to audiences reflects another cognitive skill—the ability to communicate complex ideas with words. Finally, the argumentative interaction of students in a debate reflects an even more complex cognitive ability—the ability to procees the arguments of others relatively quickly and to reformulate or adapt or defend previous positions.

I submit that this statement is one that could be understood and appreciated equally well by students, professional colleagues, and administrators. It underscores the scholarly substance of forensics.

A FINAL WORD

During the meetings the discussion often turned to the nature of a rationale and its several audiences. Ultimately, there emerged consensus on the characteristics of an effective rationale for forensics:

1. It will clearly express the academic purpose and content of forensics activities.
2. It will be cast in terms that are understood and accepted by the audiences to whom it is addressed.
3. It will be built on arguments that are probative and persuasive, meeting the proof standards of the public forum (or even a college debate).
4. It will encourage programs of study or activities to remain versatile and adaptive, not to be trapped in outmoded forms or techniques.
5. It will be compatible with the philosphy and objectives of the academic disciplines that sustain it.
6. It will help clarify and enrich the subject matter as well as the image of forensics.

At the conclusion of committee deliberations the members addressed an afterword to their colleagues: "A durable rationale for a forensics program does not occur automatically. The goals and objectives discussed in this document will be implemented only if each director chooses to do so. The achievement of the potential values of forensics presupposes an educationally motivated conception of forensics." The admonition is crucial. There is nothing inherent in a forensics program that insures positive educational outcomes. It all depends on the prevailing conception of forensics. Forensics viewed as a set of games for exhibiting verbal skills is educationally questionable and forever at risk. But forensics defined as a practicing liberal art whose essence is the creation, testing, and communication of knowledge is consonant with purposes of the academy. The committee urged, and the conference adopted, this philosophy in its statement of rationale. The work of other conferees—focusing on planning and development—seeks now to enlarge the educational dimension of forensics. "The future," as Daniel Bell once remarked, "is not an overarching leap into the distance; it begins in the present."

B. *Statement of Rationale for Forensics Education*

The 1974 National Developmental Conference on Forensics defined forensics as "an educational activity primarily concerned with using an argumentative perspective in examining problems and communicating with people."[1] Such a definition views forensics as a form of rhetorical scholarship which takes various forms, including debate, public address, and the interpretation of literature. Forensics serves as a curricular and co-curricular laboratory for improving students' abilities in research, analysis, and oral communication. This perspective organizes scholarship, stimulating research and creative activity to promote an understanding of personal and public issues through argument.

---

[1] James H. McBath, Ed., *Forensics as Communication: The Argumentative Perspective* (Skokie, Illinois: National Textbook Company, 1975) p. 11.

Cultivating the argumentative perspective involves developing and improving students' abilities in research, analysis, and effective advocacy. These skills are fostered through curricular academic instruction and participation in co-curricular activities such as debate, public address, and the interpretation of literature. These activities serve as educational laboratories in which students experiment with skills and develop their own abilities and styles of argument. Typically, forensics activities are competitive, so that students may be motivated to strive for the highest quality of work of which they are capable.

Forensics trains students in research, analysis, and critical thinking skills through discovery of lines of argument and their probative value. Students learn to identify facts, derive the underlying values, and then to utilize this information in formulating reasoned decisions. Forensics also improves proficiency in oral communication. Participants learn tenets of organization, principles of persuasion, and effective delivery skills. They develop the ability to understand the meaning and significance of literature and to convey this understanding to an audience. Broadly speaking, forensics trains students in the effective use of the range of language arts.[2]

Forensics activities are interdisciplinary, integrating learning from a wide variety of academic fields. Topics and subject matter are taken from such disciplines as economics, politics, literature, sociology, science, and communication. As students develop proficiency in critical thinking, writing, and speaking, the major goals of a liberal education are advanced. Students of diverse academic interests may derive significant benefits from forensics education.

Forensics students occupy important positions in the life of the nation. The activity offers a dependable foundation for careers in such areas as law, communication, public affairs, education, business, and politics. In addition, participants acquire knowledge and skills which are crucial to effective participation in a democratic society.

Forensics also serves as a method of self development. Students learn how to compete responsibly and effectively in an intellectual environment, and to accept maturely both winning and losing. The activity also enhances the development of positive character traits such as self-confidence and respect for dissenting opinions.

Specific forensic activities are designed to meet these educational imperatives. Debate is distinctive because of its dialectical form, providing the opportunity for intellectual clash in the testing of ideas. The creation of an argument is one of the most complex cognitive acts, since it involves research, organizing and analyzing data, recognizing and critiquing different methods of reasoning, synthesizing ideas, understanding the logic of decision making, and communicating complex ideas clearly. The argumentative interaction of students in a debate reflects an even more complex cognitive activity—processing the aguments of others quickly and responding to them by defending or adapting previous positions. Different debate contest formats give primary emphasis to varying skills from among this group.

---

[2] At its essence, forensics is an educational activity which provides students with the opportunity to develop a high level of proficiency in writing, thinking, reading, speaking, and listening. These are essential competencies which leading educators and educational groups have termed vital to intellectual advancement. The National Commission on Excellence in Education echoed these views and specified competencies, including both oral and written communication as necessary skills. (See U.S. Department of Education, National Commission of Excellence in Education, *A Nation at Risk,* 1983, p. 25). The Education Commission for the States' Task Force on Education for Economic Growth, whose members included governors, business leaders and educators, concluded that educational preparation included reading, writing, speaking and listening, and that specific goals included "the ability to engage critically and constructively in the exchange of ideas." (See Education Commission for the States, Report of the Task Force on Education for Economic Growth, *Action for Excellence,* 1983, pp. 48-49). A proposal for strengthening public education issues by the Paideia Group, whose members included Mortimer Adler, Jacques Barzun and Ernest Boyer, among others, specified language skills to include reading, writing, speaking and listening. Linguistic skills and "competence in communication" became requisite skills. (See Mortimer Adler, *The Paideia Proposal,* New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1983, p. 26). In the recent Report on Excellence in Undergraduate Education, debate is specifically mentioned as an activity that should be strengthened as having "academic functions or academic overtones." (See "Text of New Report on Excellence in Undergraduate Education," *Chronicle of Higher Education,* October 24, 1984, p. 42).

Public Address contest events incorporate an argumentative perspective in the research, analysis, organization, and development of a speech, but are unique in that they also utilize a wide range of rhetorical strategies including audience analysis, language choice, and delivery skills. These specific rhetorical skills are essential because the events emphasize the persuasion of audiences.

Oral Interpretation of Literature events are distinctive because they focus on the human perspective from a poetic stance. The oral performance of literature requires that students understand literary analysis, history, the emotional and intellectual aspects of literature, and effective vocal and physical expression. Students must acquire knowledge of literary form and style while striving to interpret literature with the purpose of enriching the audience's understanding of the human condition.

Forensics activities also are valuable for the institutions which sponsor them. Forensics shares intellectual concerns with the field of speech communication and can assist in recruiting and retaining students for the department. More generally, forensics emphasizes an institution's commitment to interdisciplinary liberal education. Through presentations to civic and community groups, it also can serve as a school or campus resource for enhancing goodwill with the public. Forensics can serve as a recruiting device to attract excellent students to the institution, and it can enhance an institution's reputation by providing a means of academic comparison with other schools, colleges, or universities. These benefits, of course, depend upon a commitment to the forensics program on the part of the sponsoring institution.

Chapter III
The Ethics of Forensics

A. *The Ethics of Forensics: An Overview*

Walter Ulrich

The process of communicating inherently involves ethical choices. The very act of interacting with another human being poses questions of what constitutes acceptable methods of interaction. These issues are especially critical in forensics. The adversarial nature of academic debate places participants in the position of having to weigh the merits of competing strategies that may have ethical implications. The persuasive speaker faces the problem of determining what uses of evidence and what types of appeals are ethically sound. The contestant in interpretation needs to understand the ethical obligations a contestant has to the author of the literature being presented.

These concerns are not new. Discussions about the ethical obligations of advocates can be found in journal articles in the fields of speech, law, political science, journalism, and a host of other disciplines. While many of the ethical choices facing a participant in forensics are similar to those of any individual in society (for example, the general condemnation of telling lies), other choices are unique to the forensic participant.

The forensics community has made several attempts to develop standards for ethical behavior. Some of the guidelines have been formulated informally, through articles, papers, or informal agreements among participants. In other cases, organizations have implemented specific guidelines for participants. For example, both the National Forensic League and the American Forensic Association have adopted codes of ethics. Some tournaments (such as the National Debate Tournament) have adopted additional rules that are ethical in nature.

While these ethical codes are helpful for any forensic participant, the codes frequently address only a few of the ethical problems facing members of the forensic community. In addition, the codes often merely consist of a list of prohibited behavior, without explaining the rationale for these prohibitions. Because of these problems, the committee on the Ethics of Advocacy was asked by the Steering Committee of the National Developmental Conference on Forensics to develop a "broad, thoughtful, philosophical statement of the ethical responsibilities of forensic participants."[1] This statement is not meant to replace existing ethical codes; rather it is designed as a supplement to those codes.

While ethics should have a central place in any discussion of forensics, determining what constitutes ethical behavior is a difficult task. Many coaches and participants label behavior as unethical which, while perhaps undesirable, should not be considered as unethical. There is a distinction between *unethical* behavior and behavior that is disliked by members of the community. Simply because a participant acts in a manner that is disagreeable to an observer does not mean the participant is *unethical.* A disorganized debater may be a poor speaker, but that does not make him or her an unethical participant.

In order to distinguish between unethical behavior and behavior that might merely be undesirable (without any moral implications), the committee decided to develop a perspective on ethics that was based on the goal of the activity. The members of the committee agreed that forensics is primarily an educational activity. As a result, any philosophy of ethics should recognize this characteristic of the activity and should attempt to develop ethical guidelines for forensics based on this goal: ethical behavior would promote the educational goals of the activity, while unethical behavior might be defined as that behavior that hinders those goals. It is the consistency of a behavior with the goals of the activity that determines whether that behavior is ethical.

---

[1] The commitee decided, with the approval of the coordinators of the conference, to address ethical problems in all forensic activities, instead of limiting the code to those activities that include advocacy.

In developing a philosphy of forensics, two types of ethical guidelines should be understood: the morality of duty and the morality of aspiration.[2] The morality of duty consists of those rules that any participant should follow in order to be considered ethical. These rules constitute the minimum requirements for any ethical participant. There are certain expectations that any participant should meet. The current ethical codes often outline these expectations; any participant violating them is to be condemned.

A complete system of morality goes beyond a mere listing of minimum rules of behavior. In addition to these minimum rules, there should also be a set of goals for the ethical participant. The morality of aspiration consists of these, often abstract, goals for the participant. These are goals, sometimes unobtainable, towards which the participant should strive. While an individual may never be able to reach all of these goals, ethical individuals attempt to come as close as possible to these standards. While we do not condemn those individuals who fail to achieve these goals, we praise those who come close. The morality of duty consists of the minimum standards expected of all participants; the morality of aspiration consists of the highest goals of the community.

Any discussion of the ethics of forensics should address both types of moral statements. The regulations in the current ethical codes is directed toward the first type of morality, a list of minimum standards for all participants to follow. While these minimum guidelines are necessary, participants should strive to go beyond these minimum standards in order to achieve the highest possible level of ethical behavior.

This statement on ethics includes a discussion of ethics from the perspective of all members of the forensic community. Ethical behavior should be promoted by *all* of those in the forensics community. The entire forensics community as a whole needs to develop guidelines for ethical behavior, develop rules that promote ethical behavior, and publicize ethical guidelines. Without these guidelines, individuals may engage in unethical behavior, not because of malicious intent, but because of ignorance.

The forensics coach should promote ethical behavior. This obligation should be evident in all the roles that he or she may play during a season: that of coach, tournament administrator, judge, and recruiter. While the adversarial nature of some forensic activities may help deter and correct some ethical problems, this process must occasionally be assisted by the coach of teams involved.

The participants will always play a critical part of any system of ethics for, in the final analysis, it is the participants who decide what behavior will be practiced. Since the ethical implications of many activities depends on the intent of the individual, the ethical responsibilities of the contestant will not always be the counterpart of the ethical responsibilities of the coach; the student should go beyond those guidelines and consider the motivation behind his or her actions. This is especially true when one considers the morality of aspiration; the coach and the judge cannot force an individual to aspire to be ethical; it is up to the individual contestant to realize the value of ethical behavior and to attempt to seek to engage in the most ethical behavior possible

The vitality and educational value of forensics depends upon both the development of ethical standards and the acceptance of these standards by those in the forensics community. While this document outlines a broad philosophy of forensics, it is up to the individual members of the community to reflect on the principles in this document, as well as the rationale behind these principles, and to apply those principles. Developing an ethical activity requires the active involvement of *all* members of the community. Failure to promote ethical communication can only undermine the educational benefits of the forensics activity.

---

[2] Lon L. Fuller, *The Morality of Law* (New Haven: Yale University, Press, 1964).

B. *The Ethics of Forensics*

PREAMBLE

Recognizing the important role played by communication in society, the forensic community should strive to promote ethical rhetorical behavior. Members of the community should be guided by an ethical vision which highlights educational benefits that are to be gained through forensics. Since all people in society are ultimately affected by the form and content of communication transactions, *all* members of the forensic community bear the responsibility of maintaining a consistent and coherent ethical system. They should consider the moral consequences of their behavior and reflect upon why and how they communicate in a particular way. For forensics to promote educational goals, the vitality of human interaction, and socially responsible actions, communication must be guided by a robust moral vision. Such a vision includes not only minimum standards of conduct, but also higher goals to which people should aspire.

Like forensics itself, this document is educational. The deliberations that led to its composition were educational for the group of forensic educators who discussed the general and specific issues raised at the National Developmental Conference. Moreover, we hope the statement will be educational for others by encouraging their reflection on the issues and their thoughtful participation in the continuous dialogue of word and deed by which a field's ethical standards are constructed and refined. No small group of persons, meeting in a limited series of discussions, can presume to have addressed all the ethical issues that concern our undertaking, nor can such a group establish standards for ethical behavior that would apply universally and for all time. So, we had better be clear about what we have tried to do. First, we have tried to establish a perspective on ethics consonant with the nature of forensics as an educational activity with a strong competitive dimension. Second, we have tried to articulate general ethical guidelines for participants in forensics. Third, we have addressed certain specific ethical problems which, if our group is at all representative of the activity's participants, would appear to be especially relevant at this time. Unlike the codes of conduct established by various forensic organizations and state and local bodies governing school competition, this document is not intended to sanction behavior. It is intended to represent the best understanding of ethical principles that a small group of forensic educators could forge in a short period of time, and to stimulate further discussion within the forensic community.

Our hope is that the forensic community shares our vision of reflective, ethical participation. With the eventual establishment of shared ethical guidelines, new members of the community can be educated and socialized, participants' ethical choices can be supported, unethical behavior can be discouraged, and the ethical system itself can be further assessed and refined. Untimately, by taking an ethical position, the community contributes to its own health: respect from those outside the community is enhanced; the activity itself is perpetuated; and with a clear vision of what is good and right for forensics, we are in a better position to improve forensic activities. The quality of forensics and the quality of its ethical vision are mutually enriching.

There are general ethical codes and legal responsibilities which fall upon everyone and this document is not intended to supercede them. However, specific spheres of human activity give rise to specific and often unique ethical questions. Therefore, an ethic of forensics must take account of the essential nature of forensics itself. The central characteristic of forensics is that it serves an educational purpose as a mode of rhetorical scholarship. This scholarship takes various forms, including debate, public address and the interpretation of literature. In all of these, participants learn by engaging in a communicative, interactive process of influence aimed at critical decision making. Whether the objective of inquiry be beauty, truth, or both, forensics operates through the full, free exchange of ideas. Finally, forensics is conventionally practiced within competitive formats which serve to challenge and motivate participants.

From the foregoing characterization of forensics, it follows that an ethical system for forensics must be informed by (1) an overarching concern for the educational mission of the activity, (2) a particular focus on communication practices as central to the activity, and (3) a sensitivity to the problems of competition within educational enterprises. We must respect participants with differing talents, goals, and perspectives, and conduct ourselves in a manner which fosters respect for these other individuals and encourages their participation. In addition, we should remind ourselves, all ethical evaluation to be fair, must be cautious, respectful of others, and sensitive to differences in circumstances that affect individuals and cases. We must respect diversity and innovation in ideas and strategies, and promote the sound, critical testing of these new approaches to forensics as well as to extant practices.

ETHICAL GUIDELINES FOR EDUCATORS

In any forensic program, the decisions made by participants as they carry out the diverse facets of the program have ethical implications. It is the responsibility of the forensic educator to maximize the opportunity for ethical development and behavior among all participants. Because the educator normally assumes a variety of roles, including those of coach, judge, and tournament administrator, it is important to consider separately the ethical responsibilities that each of these roles imply.

Because forensics is primarily an educational activity, educators in their capacities as coaches should emphasize learning before competitive success, and should teach this view to their students. Because students differ in talent, experience, motivation, and purpose, pedagogical methods should be adapted to student needs; at the same time, however, coaching efforts should supplement, not substitute for, student efforts. Because many forensic events are laboratories in argumentation, the educator should strive to teach students the principles and objectives of sound reasoning. In keeping with the mission of sponsoring academic institutions, educators should strive to teach students the value of rigorous scholarship. Because forensics is inherently characterized by a diversity of approaches and activities which, nonetheless, possess a common interest in the advancement of forensic excellence, tolerance is a virtue, and educators should avoid prejudicially denigrating other educators, students, programs, or activities. Because all students can benefit from forensic experience at some level, and because all students, at whatever level, require and deserve educators' attention and efforts, educators should strive to treat all students fairly and to promote equality of opportunity for appropriate and challenging learning experiences.

Judges and critics are an integral part of the educational process in forensics; they are contributing participants in a process which seeks the full, free testing of ideas, and at the same time are primary reinforcers of student behavior. As such, judges must delicately balance two considerations: the need for rigorous examination of any and all views, however unpopular, unrealistic, or repugnant, and the guidance and direction of student behavior, attitudes, and beliefs in socially responsible ways. By nature, all judging is interventionary to some degree; hence, all judges are ethically obligated to balance these considerations, applying their expertise as judges in good faith. The following guidelines are intended to assist judges in their determinations.

Judges should act always to promote and protect the process of intellectual exchange. Student creativity in the selection and construction of discourse is to be affirmed for the purpose of promoting the sound testing of ideas, and intervention by judges on the basis of prejudice or personal preference is to be discouraged. Judges should strive at all times to render impartial decisions and fully to disclose their reasons according to tournament rules of procedure; they should, therefore, attempt to remove themselves from situations in which conflicts of interest or prejudices are likely to jeopardize such decisions. Recognizing that determination of authorial intent is problematic, judges of interpretive events should respect diverse student interpretations. Judges are ethically obligated to enforce the rules of the tournaments or events in which they participate. Moreover, judges have a positive obligation to discourage actions inimical to the forensic process. Recognizing the crucial importance of the veracity and quality of evidence and other materials, we believe student intention to be irrelevant to the evaluation of violations of evidence standards; judges should discount the probative force of material not conforming to the standards discussed below and should apply appropriate sanctions. In other areas, where considerations of intent or circumstance do bear upon the evaluation of actions, judges should act according to their consciences, recognizing that is is not always a judge's task to enforce every student or coach responsibility. It is the primary responsibility of the educator as coach, rather than as judge, to regulate the content of student speeches.

In determining whether and to what extent to intervene, critics of debate should consider in addition that the adversarial nature of debate offers a good but imperfect means of revealing the weaknesses or undesirability of substantive positions and *may* lessen the need for intervention.

Finally, because the critic's role is an inherently educative one, all judges should strive for competence and conscientiousness in deliberation, including familarity with accepted standards of forensic excellence. Coaches who employ non-professional or paraprofessional critics to fulfill their tournament judging obligations are responsible for ensuring that such critics will be able to provide a high-quality learning experience for students.

In administering tournaments, educators should strive to ensure that all students have an equal opportunity to excel. Educators should be particularly cognizant of the issues involved in scheduling and judge assignment and should seek to promote high quality and fair learning experiences for all contestants. Further, tournaments should not be designed to operate at a profit, and relevant professional codes should be followed.

In recruiting students, the educator should be cautious, open, and forthright. Recognizing that students are free to attend the schools of their choice and free to transfer, educators nonetheless should be sensitive to the problem of tampering with other programs, should not recruit students under such conditions that the learning experiences of existing students would be compromised, and should be honest in evaluating the relative strengths and weaknesses of the programs and institutions in question. At all times, the best interests of the student (including other academic non-forensic interests) should take precedence over the competitive interests of the recruiting program.

The forensic educator assumes additional ethical responsibilities regardless of specific role. In all capacities, educators function as role-models to peers, to junior colleagues, and to students; they should therefore aspire to the highest ethical standards in their own conduct. They should act professionally at all times and with a respect for the dignity and civil rights of students; in particular, harassment of, or discrimination against, students on the basis of race, gender, age, religion, national origin, or similarly irrelevant traits is condemned. They should not overburden students so that the latter's non-forensic educational aims and activities are jeopardized. Educators also should inform participants about the ethical choices inherent in forensic competition and the nature and desirability of ethical conduct. They should assist students to develop the capacity for critical self-observation of motives and actions, to explore alternative ethical decisions, and to make wise choices. In order to emphasize the importance of ethical conduct, positive reinforcements for exemplary conduct should be devised. Appropriate sanctions for unethical behavior also should be applied where needed. Additionally, educators should scrutinize the ways in which tournament rules and formats foster or hinder ethical conduct and should develop innovations consonant with ethical ideals. In short, the forensic educator should foster ethical attitudes and behaviors among all members of the forensic community.

ETHICAL GUIDELINES FOR THE STUDENT

Students participating in forensics are obligated to adhere to high ethical standards. Here we are concerned with the ethical choices students make for themselves, not with the standards to be applied by critic/judges. An ethical commitment by students is essential because the value of forensics is directly dependent upon the integrity of those involved. For that reason, it is the duty of each student to participate honestly, fairly, and in such a way as to avoid communication behaviors that are deceptive, misleading, or dishonest. Students should strive to place forensic competition in a proper perspective as ethical decisions are pondered. The goal of winning must be evaluated within a framework of educational values. Forensic contests are not ends in themselves but means to an end.

Furthermore, student participants must remember that forensics is an oral, interactive process. It is the student's duty to aspire to the objective of effective oral expression of ideas. When ideas are expressed in an unintelligible fashion, the forensic process is abused. The interactive dimension of forensics suggests that behaviors which belittle, degrade, demean, or otherwise dehumanize others are not in the best interests of forensics because they interfere with the goals of education and personal growth. The ethical forensic competitor recognizes the rights of others and communicates with respect for opponents, colleagues and critics.

Student advocates should compete with respect for the principles and objectives of reasoned discourse. Students who invent definitions involving unwarranted shifts in the meanings of words fail to maintain a respect for the integrity of language. Students who deliberately employ specious reasoning as a strategy fail to maintain a respect for the integrity of the forensic decision making process.

Student interpreters should maintain a respect for the integrity of literature. Because a piece of literature represents the personal expression of an author, students should not rewrite portions of an author's work and represent those alterations as if they were the product of the author.

Evidence plays an important role in forensic advocacy. Arguments can be no stronger than the evidence that supports them. If the evidence is misrepresented, distorted, or fabricated, the conclusions drawn are meaningless and ethically suspect. In order to understand these implications, the advocate should be familiar with the role of evidence in critical decision making, as well as with the methods of scholarship in discovering and recording evidence. The content of, and citations for evidence used by advocates should be open to inspection by their opponents. Advocates should use only evidence which is in the public domain and, hence, open to critical evaluation by others.

Advocates should clearly identify, during their speeches, the source of all the evidence they use. Such identification should include information relevent to the credibility of the author, if available, the source of publication and date. Omitting the source of evidence denies the audience the opportunity to evaluate the quality of the information. Since the strength of evidence depends on the qualifications of the individual being quoted, this information is critical to any evaluator of argument. Advocates are responsible for the integrity of all the evidence they utilize, even when the evidence is not researched by the individual advocate. An advocate should not introduce evidence that is distorted or fabricated. In determining whether evidence has been distorted, the advocate should ask if the evidence deviates from the quality, quantity, probability, or degree of force of the author's position on the point in question. Any such deviation should be avoided, because such alteration can give undue rhetorical force to an advocate's argument.

In public speaking events, the discourse should be the original work of the student presenting it. This means that the student neither employs speeches written by others nor uses the ideas of authors without giving credit to the original source. Either practice is a form of plagiarism.

Students should abide by all published contest regulations and schedules governing the events and tournaments in which they compete. The ethical competitor avoids the temptation to misuse or ignore contest regulations and schedules for personal advantage, and instead seizes opportunities to improve contest formats, procedures, and regulations.

Students competing in forensic contests share a unique opportunity to learn and to experience personal growth. This environment serves the goals of forensics best when student participants recognize their responsibility to preserve and promote opportunities for such a forensic education. Students should remember that forensic contests are often subject to public scrutiny and that reaction to forensic practices may aid or inhibit the future course which the forensic activity takes. Thus, students should carefully consider the values inherent in the claims they advance and the behaviors they display. Communication which engenders ill-will and disrespect for forensics ultimately reduces the utility of forensics for all who participate in it and should, therefore, be avoided.

As indicated at the outset, this document is intended to outline an ethic for the entire forensic community. While it explicitly identifies certain direct participants in the activity, there are other, less centrally involved but nonetheless vitally important members of the community upon whom ethical responsibilities fall. Because forensics is a valuable educational experience that can benefit all students, academic institutions may be ethically obligated to offer this experience and to commit the resources which will ensure its availability and quality. Similarly, alumni of forensic programs, having benefited themselves from this experience, may be ethically obligated to work for the continued availability of the experience for others. The future of forensics is in the hands of *all* members of the community.

C. RESOLUTIONS

1. THE FORENSIC COMMUNITY HAS AN OBLIGATION TO CALL ATTENTION TO ETHICAL ISSUES AND DISSEMINATE INFORMATION ON THE ETHICS OF FORENSICS.

Numerous professional oganizations have codified rules for ethical conduct, and the National Developmental Conference has produced a statement of "Ethics of Forensics." If participants are to be able to make fully informed ethical choices and if the community is to discuss and further develop a vision of ethical forensic behavior, access to ethical guidelines, their content and rationale, should be readily available. Ethical guidelines should be included in textbooks and in professional journals (including the *Journal of the American Forensic Association, the National Forensic Journal, Rostrum, The Forensic, Debate Issues, Speaker and Gavel, Progressive Forensics, Communication Education* as well as other education and communication journals). Discussion of ethical issues should be encouraged at institutes and workshops, at professional conferences and meetings, and at tournaments and league meetings.

2. THE AMERICAN FORENSIC ASSOCIATION SHOULD PUBLISH AND DISSEMINATE A SPEAKER'S GUIDEBOOK OF SCHOLARLY CITATIONS TO ASSIST STUDENTS IN PROPERLY CREDITING MATERIALS USED IN FORENSIC COMPETITION.

A Speaker's Guidebook to scholarly documentation and citation would provide a common source that could be used by students in oral and written presentation. This booklet should also include a clear statement of copyright provisions related to oral interpretation and readers theatre. Such a booklet could help assure uniformity in the form of citations and remove any reason for inadequate or improper identification of sources.

3. THE ENTRY OF STUDENTS INTO TOURNAMENT EVENTS SHOULD NOT VIOLATE THE LETTER OR INTENT OF TOURNAMENT ELIGIBILITY RULES, WHEN STATED, OR VIOLATE THE PRINCIPLE OF ROUGH EQUIVALENCE OF EXPERIENCE.

Students will gain more from competitive activities when the level of competition which they face is appropriate and predictable. Less experienced students should not have to face more skilled competitors unexpectedly. The purpose for creating junior and novice divisions is undermined when tournament guidelines are ignored. Coaches have the right to enter students in higher levels of competition, when appropriate and consistent with educational goals.

D. STATEMENTS FROM POSITION PAPERS

REASONS FOR UNETHICAL BEHAVIOR

ROBIN REESE (CENTRAL MISSOURI). Academic debate is an *educational* activity. Yet, the reward system is too frequently based on *winning* rather than *learning*. This leads to the questionable assumption that debaters who win are also those who learn. Hensley and Prentice recognize that "most ethical problems stem from the debater's perception of the importance of winning."[3]

WALTER ULRICH (VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY). In debate, as in real life, there will always be some tension between "winning" and acting in an ethical way. It is important that debaters understand the nature of this trade-off, and that they be encouraged to act in an ethical manner.

JOHN T. MORELLO (JAMES MADISON UNIVERSITY). Forensics participants, guided only by individual ethics, are not likely to be able to judge carefully their behavior as right or wrong since they are not disinterested in the outcomes pursued by those behaviors.

DAVID A. FRANK (UNIVERSITY OF OREGON). Kristine Davis has accurately located the reason why most ethical violations have occurred in the forensic world. She suggests that some violations may be gratuitous, malicious and premeditated. Most violations or misdeeds, according to Davis, are due simply to ignorance and to the failure of our profession to create, promulgate and enforce a code of ethics.[4]

THE NATURE OF ETHICS IN FORENSICS

RANDALL LAKE (UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA). As both Zarefsky and Ulrich have observed, numerous forensic practices have been condemned, erroneously, as "unethical" when in fact those practices have nothing to do with ethics. Spreading may or may not be pedagogically sound (reasonable arguments can be generated on both sides of this question), but it is not a question of morality. The reason, on my account, is that rate of speaking is an accidental, not essential, characteristic of advocacy.

DAVID A. FRANK (UNIVERSITY OF OREGON). We need to have a moral idiom which reinforces language which reflects a humane treatment of audience and opponent. Simply put then, a moral idiom of relationship would urge competitors to recognize the humanity of their opponents and that of their audience and that such recognition should be reflected in their language.

ROBIN REESE (CENTRAL MISSOURI). While other guidelines may be appropriate, I urge that we adopt one essential guideline: ethical communicative behavior contributes to the pursuit of probable truth.

DAVID A. FRANK (UNIVERSITY OF OREGON). Rather than searching for a formal set of moral laws it might be more desireable to establish some moral principles which would guide rather than bind (in most instances) the behavior of coaches and students. The differences between being rule guided and rule bound may be a subtle difference, but in the subtlety we may find the strength of this approach. A rule guided individual has embodied certain principles and standards as his or her own. They are a part of the individuals moral sensibility. The rule bound individual follows an external set of laws because of a fear of punishment or enforcement. The truly ethical and moral person understands and has reflected upon the reasons why he or she behaves and communicates in a certain way. And those reasons will flow from a sincere belief in and a concurrence with the philosophy binding a set of rules together.

---

[3] Dana Hensley and Diana Prentice , *Mastering Competitive Debate* (Caldwell, Idaho: Clark Publishing Company, 1977), p.137

[4] Kristine Davis-Bartanen, "Ethics of Individual Events Coaching: Getting a Leg Up on the Competition," paper presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, n.d., p.3.

RANDALL LAKE (UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA). Obedience *per se* to moral rules is vacuous unless those rules have some *purpose.* That is, adherence to moral codes is not an end in itself, but only a means to an end, the achievement of a particular vision of the good.

IMPROVING THE ETHICS OF FORENSICS

ROBIN REESE (CENTRAL MISSOURI). Ethics cannot be legislated; ethical judgments must be made within each individual. Because the ethical nature of communicative behavior is so strongly determined by the conscious intent of the communicator, and because that intent is only truly known to the communicator, an outside observer/judge cannot accurately make absolute ethical decisions about the behavior of others. What is unethical for one communicator may be ethical for another. . . . One of the values of debate is learning to make sound rhetorical choices. Rules inhibit both the right and the responsibility to choose between good or bad, ethical or unethical means. Thus the imposition of a rigid, absolutist ethical code violates the essence of ethical decision-making.

JOHN T. MORELLO (JAMES MADISON). The current code does not offer a perspective from which students *should* approach their ethical responsibilities. In no section of the code is there a positive statement suggesting that students have the duty to communicate ethically in rounds of forensic competition. Indeed, given that the penalties for a breach of the code are meted out by external agencies (the judge or the Professional Relations Committee), it would appear that ethical matters are to be decided by persons other than the individual competitor.

ROSS SMITH (WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY). In order to guide behavior so that students may learn, we try to create games that reward behavior we seek to teach. If our game is not accomplishing its objectives, we should change the game, not the people. The former is simpler and impinges less on the freedom of expression of participants. If the game itself is left unchanged, broad philosophical statements will have little or no effect. Few are the players who will reduce their chances in order to conform to a philosophical plea from a conference. Worse yet, the philosophical statement may become another "theory argument" introduced into debates for strategic, as opposed to moral, purposes.

JOHN T. MORELLO (JAMES MADISON). Critics might assert that "too many rules would take the fun out of forensics." I cannot agree. On the contrary, the continuing absence of norms will only serve to harm us in the long run. All games develop expectations of the "right" conduct for players. It is easier to ensure that a game is played the "right" way when the players know what behaviors are accepted and what behaviors are to be avoided. The longer we go letting our students think that almost anything goes in forensics, the harder it will be for us to maintain any control over the process of the activity. Our duty as professional forensic educators is to make clear to our students that they have ethical burdens as advocates, and to indicate that we are serious about those burdens being upheld. The failure to do that means only that forensics will run the risk of becoming more and more an isolated and trivial exercise—a fate which need not, and must not, occur.

THE ETHICS OF EVIDENCE

CAROLYN KEEFE (WEST CHESTER UNIVERSITY). When an advocate utilizes material—either legitimately or not—that has been produced by another person, he or she "cashes in," so to speak, on someone else's property. No matter what the form of the "product," it has resulted from some expenditure of time, which in industrialized societies is equivalent to outlay of money. In many cases, extensive education and experience have been requisite for the production of the work. Talent, that amorphous but recognizable factor, is yet another investment made by the creator.

CAROLYN KEEFE (WEST CHESTER UNIVERSITY). The misuse of sources can be shown to have undesirable effects upon the communication process. In plagiarizing, a speaker appropriates, usually without acknowledgement, a message that belongs to an original sender. The impression is thereby created that the oral sender is the source of certain facts and possesses analytical ability and aptness of expression that may not be characteristic of that person. Thus a false speaker's ethos may be generated by the receivers. Plagiarism also deprives the original sender of both the responsibility for the material and the credit for developing it.

DAVID A. FRANK (UNIVERSITY OF OREGON). What appears to be needed, besides a full scale educational campaign designed to inform students about the standards of scholarship, is a speaker's equivalent to the *MLA Handbook*. Since the days of Wichelns we have recognized that oratory is a different form of communication than literature. While the speaker should meet all the MLA standards in gathering evidence and proof, the speaker would perhaps confront fewer ethical problems if a handbook on the orator's scholarly responsibilities was available.

JOHN T. MORELLO (JAMES MADISON UNIVERSITY). Just about every debate textbook reminds us that the quality of evidence is a function of the credibility of its source. Yet our students freely and indiscriminately introduce evidence without revealing the identity or credentials of authors and sources. As a result, evidence becomes a bulk quantity and argumentative judgements become more and more based on the amount instead of the quality of the data. This consequence is inevitable, because speakers have *concealed* the very information necessary for receivers to make informed qualitative judgements about the evidence being used.

WALTER ULRICH (VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY). The standard for determining if evidence is in context should be, "would the author of the evidence agree with the statement, as quoted?" It is unreasonable to expect the author to support the conclusion of the team (for example, people quoted on the link to a disadvantage may not agree with the impact of the disadvantage), but the person should agree with the statement attributed to him or her.

WALTER ULRICH (VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY). The harm lies, not in the use by debaters of evidence researched by others, but in the inappropriate use of this type of assistance, as is the case where the sole function of the coach becomes to research evidence, where the "overcoaching" represents an unhealthy view towards competition, or where a coach substitutes researching for coaching.

SPECIFIC UNETHICAL PRACTICES

WALTER ULRICH (VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY). It is normal for students to transfer to other institutions for academic reasons; why not allow debaters to transfer to another institution when *they* think they can have a better educational experience at the new institution? The only problem exists when the student is coerced with inappropriate means. While there are examples of students that have made unwise decisions to transfer, I am not sure we can prevent such choices, nor do I think it is our job to make those choices for our debaters. What we can do is to make sure that the decisions are made for educational reasons. We should not condone the "buying" of debaters.

JOHN T. MORELLO (JAMES MADISON UNIVERSITY). What do our students learn about their responsibilities as advocates if we grant them the license to offer any extremist positions they want? Ethical advocates in the "real world" are expected to consider the long-run implications of the positions they maintain. These positions are expected to be consistent with the goals and values of the society in which the advocate operates. Forensics participants should operate under the same expectation. . . Our students need to be reminded that debate *is* an instrument of democracy, and that effective and ethical debating must operate with respect for democratic values.

Chapter IV
Promotions and Tenure Standards

A. *Promotion and Tenure Standards in Forensics: An Agenda For Deliberation*

Craig A. Dudczak and David Zarefsky

The task of our work group was to develop "a careful statement which could be used to advise departmental promotion and tenure committees on specifically how to evaluate the work of a forensics coach." The purpose of this paper is to identify the issues addressed in order to develop that statement, and to provide a general sense of the direction the answers of our work group took.

It is important to begin with a sense of context. In our view, evidence does not support the belief that there is a crisis—that forensics educators face undue hardship in obtaining promotion and tenure. In explaining this statement, it would be useful to survey the prevailing trends in higher education and in speech communication departments for the standards employed in promotion and tenure reviews. While descriptive in nature, these trends provide a backdrop against which the special obligations of the forensics educator should be considered.

It is generally held that scholarship has become an increasingly important criterion for promotion and tenure. Notwithstanding the widespread acceptance of this belief, and examples which appear to prove the rule,[1] Emmert reports that teaching remains the highest ranked standard for promotion and tenure within departments of communication.[2] Further, even with four-year colleges, criteria for evaluation associated with scholarship (published articles, books, etc.) ranked no higher than fourth among nine criteria surveyed.[3] Since the categories Emmert uses to report his data do not distinguish between graduate/research institutions and undergraduate/teaching schools, the relatively low ranking may mask wide variance.

Emmert concludes that four-year schools do appear to place greater emphasis on publishing than do two-year schools. However, he notes that "if there is a 'publish or perish' phenomenon in higher education, it does not appear to apply to the discipline of speech communication as much as to other disciplines."[4]

How do these findings affect the likelihood of institutions in the field of communication receiving tenure compared with those of other disciplines? Adelsek and Gomberg report that in the academic years 1978-79, of the full-time faculty members formally considered for tenure, 58% were granted tenure and 22% remained eligible for future consideration. Further, they reported that the range for the tenure approval rate was highest in engineering with 70% and lowest in the social sciences with 53%.[5] Emmert reports that the odds for receiving tenure in speech communication are somewhat better than 50-50.[6] So it would appear that the field of speech communication does not vary appreciably in tenure approval when compared with other disciplines.

---

[1] Jack Matthews, "Tenure: Getting Some In and Some Out," *ACA Bulletin*, No. 42 (October, 1982), p. 19.

[2] Philip Emmert, "Salary, Merit, Promotion and Tenure Practices in Speech Communication Departments," *ACA Bulletin*, No. 36 (April, 1981), pp. 72, 73.

[3] Emmert, pp. 72, 73.

[4] Emmert, pp. 72, 73. See also the special issue of *Communication Education, 29* (September, 1980).

[5] Frank J. Adelsek and Irene L. Gomberg, *Tenure Practices at Four-Year Colleges and Universities*, Higher Education Panel Reports No. 48 (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, July, 1980).

[6] Emmert, p. 73.

When a similar question is asked concerning the tenure approval ratings for forensics educators compared with others in the field, there is a void of comparative data. A very recent survey conducted by Sharon Porter of Northern Arizona reports that about half of current directors are tenured and that about 70% of the programs responding had a tenure-track position for the forensics director.[7] Other data suggests that forensics directors do not remain in active coaching for the duration of their teaching careers,[8] but does not attribute their departure to denial of tenure or failure to obtain promotion. Porter's survey reports the following reasons reported by department chairs for denial of tenure of current or former forensics directors (number of respondents citing each category is noted in parentheses): lack publications (8); ineffective teaching (6); ineffective management (4); and failure to get Ph.D. (4). Porter's results do not indicate how many candidates are reflected by this or whether multiple reasons were cited for an individual case.[9]

At this juncture it would seem that the rationale for arguing for consideration of the obligation faced by the forensics educator is not based on any verifiable differences in tenure and promotion rates. This statement does not mean that there are not any differences in tenure and promotion approval between forensics educators and others in the field of speech communication. However, absent hard evidence, we might be building a "straw man" to contend that we suffer adversely in promotion and tenure decisions.

The purpose of our statement, then, is not to whine about how we are mistreated but to offer special guidelines for use by departments and institutions. In this way we will build on the work of the 1974 National Developmental Conference on Forensics. The conferees at Sedalia recommended:

> The forensics educator should meet the department and institutional criteria for promotion, tenure, and compensation. Typically, the primary criterion for evaluation should be teaching effectiveness, including the directing of forensics as a teaching function.[10]

The import of this recommendation was twofold. First, the Conference recommended that "work in forensics should be evaluated primarily in terms of teaching effectiveness."[11] Second, the implicit assumption was that the director of forensics would be afforded adequate support to fulfill the responsibilities pertaining to classroom teaching, scholarship, and service. The Conference rationale noted, "Assuming support consistent with their responsibilities, forensics educators should be fully capable of meeting the requirements set. They should not be held to higher standards, nor do they seek lower standards."[12]

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

Before discussing issues selected for deliberation, the group concurred on two assumptions: (1) Tenure and promotion reviews reflect both an evaluation of past performance and a judgment of future promise. The awarding of tenure is the most serious affirmation of an institution's commitment to the individual. Given the responsible execution of duties, it represents a commitment to employ the individual until retirement, and it is granted to assure freedom of thought and inquiry.

---

[7] Sharon Porter, "Preliminary Analysis on Promotion and Tenure Survey," Unpublished. The results cited here are from the preliminary data analysis of a return by 127 Directors of Forensics and 94 Chairpersons. These data are used with the permission of Sharon Porter.

[8] See Donald Klopf and Stanley Rives, "Characteristics of High School and College Forensics Directors," *JAFA*, 2 (January, 1965), pp. 34-35; Betty Anderson and Irene Matlon, "A Description of High School Forensics Programs Report on a National Survey," *JAFA*, 10 (Winter, 1974), 123-124.

[9] Porter, Preliminary Analysis.

[10] "Recommendations on Preparation, Status, and Rewards," *Forensics as Communication: The Argumentative Perspective*, Ed. James H. McBath (Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook, 1975), p. 47.

[11] "Recommendations on Preparation, Status, and Rewards," p. 47.

[12] "Recommendations on Preparation, Status, and Rewards," p. 47.

(2) Missions of colleges and universities vary considerably. As a consequence, the common evaluation standards for promotion and tenure—teaching, scholarship, and service—may be weighted differently from institution to institution. In recognition of institutional differences, the Conference should not attempt to impose a single standard weighting of evaluation criteria. Instead, it should expect forensics professionals to understand and satisfy the expectations of their own institutions.

ADMINISTRATIVE OR ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS

The most fundamental question is whether forensics coaches should occupy administrative or academic roles. The administrative position, analogous to that enjoyed by athletic coaches, would recognize the administrative component of the forensics director's assignment, might afford a longer contract which would be financially more rewarding, and would divorce the director of forensics from pressures of promotion and tenure. On the other hand, such an arrangement would further separate the forensics director from the academic discipline, arguably reducing the educational benefit of the activity.[13] It would limit the ability of the forensics director at some point in his or her career to "retire" from forensics and assume full-time teaching and research duties. And it would seem counter-intuitive to proclaim that we are "forensics educators" and then to eschew regular academic appointments.

HOW MUCH SHOULD FORENSICS "COUNT?"

Assuming that the work group favored an academic rather than an administrative role, it then addressed the question of how much forensics ought to "count" in promotion and tenure reviews. We followed the general principle suggested by Young: that forensics should carry the same proportionate weight in the review as the proportion of the director's total effort which the institution assigns to forensics. At this point there is a good opportunity to urge institutions to be clear at the time of appointment in stating their expectations and scheduling the director's time accordingly.

SHOULD FORENSICS EDUCATORS MEET THE SAME TESTS THAT THEIR COLLEAGUES ARE REQUIRED TO MEET?

This question is essentially ambiguous. Both the Sedalia Conference report and several of this year's position papers assert that forensics educators should pass muster by the same tests as anyone else; they should not and do not seek lower standards. At the same time, there is widespread recognition that traditional standards, traditionally applied, are unlikely to give fair evaluation of the work of the forensics specialist. This seeming inconsistency results from confusing *standards* with *criteria*. The work group believed that the following propositions may help to resolve the confusion.

(1) Forensics educators should be evaluated by the same standards as their colleagues. As suggested below, we endorsed the traditional triumvirate of teaching, scholarship, and service. (It might be argued that these are improperly weighted *in general*, but such an argument would take us far beyond our charge and probably would weaken our credibility.)

(2) Forensics educators should satisfy each standard at the same level of *quality* expected of their colleagues: their teaching, scholarship, and service should be just as good.

---

[13] See David H. Smith and Helen H. Popovich, "Academic Debate: The Dean's Perspective," *ACA Bulletin*, No. 34 (October, 1980), p. 70.

(3) The *amounts* of teaching, scholarship, and service, however, may distinguish forensics educators from their colleagues. Because of the nature of their assignment, forensics educators will *show more* in some categories and *less* in others. Evaluation, therefore, should be the result not of counting contributions but of *weighing* their quality. Moreover, the *criteria* for determining whether standards are met will distinguish forensics educators from their colleagues, because of the non-traditional circumstances in which forensics educators engage in teaching, scholarship, and service.

WHAT STANDARDS SHOULD BE MET?

That forensics should be considered primarily as a teaching function both restates the recommendation of the Sedalia conference[14] and reflects the opinion of many department chairs.[15] These assessments are not contradicted, however, by the task group proposition: that forensics educators should be evaluated according to all three standards of teaching, scholarship, and service, but that the criteria for determining whether these standards are met will necessarily vary with the nature of the faculty position.

Perhaps the major challenge is to identify the *criteria* to be applied in determining whether forensics professionals meet the standards. The group tried to be open-ended rather than prescriptive—identifying possible criteria rather than designing any one instrument and giving it the imprimatur of the Developmental Conference.

HOW SHOULD FORENSICS TEACHING BE EVALUATED?

In considering the evaluation of teaching, the work group was especially sensitive to (1) the latitude of the instructor to make reasonable selections from among the methods for evaluating his or her teaching, provided that it *is* evaluated, (2) procedures to assure anonymity and confidentiality of individual evaluations, and (3) assigning special weight to a consistent pattern of positive or negative evaluations rather than to idiosyncratic reactions. This last guideline is particularly important when the sample size is small.

The committee also rejected the spurious assumption that the students' competitive success is by itself a valid measure of the quality of teaching. Some numerical criteria such as size of program, number of tournaments entered, and tournament success may be considered so long as they are related to the qualifications of staff, budget, and proportion of time allotted for the forensics assignment. Without some consideration of these factors, it may become difficult to justify the expenditure of financial and staff resources. Moreover, there is little or no consensus about what constitutes competitive success.

HOW SHOULD FORENSICS SCHOLARSHIP BE EVALUATED?

In assessing contributions to the discipline, a few guidelines are particularly important. First, the goal is to *weigh* rather than to *count* these contributions. Second, if they are to serve as contributions to a discipline they cannot be ephemeral but must be preserved in some form. Third, peer review is particularly helpful here. Just as most journal publication is now refereed, many of the items in the list above rely on the judgment of one's professional peers, and this fact should be noted by promotion and tenure committees. Congalton's suggestion that letters of evaluation be sought from peers outside of one's own institution is a good one. Those consulted should all be persons in a position to evaluate the candidate's work. Some may be proposed by the candidate but others should be selected by the department or the review committee.

---

[14] "Recommendations on Preparation, Status, and Rewards," p. 47.

[15] Jack Kay, "The Evaluation and Documentation of Forensic Endeavors: A Preliminary Survey of College Programs," paper presented at the Central States Speech Association convention, Chicago, April, 1981, p. 5.

HOW SHOULD FORENSICS SERVICE BE EVALUATED?

Recognition of the administrative role as a service to the institution would give *de jure* acknowledgment to *de facto* responsibilities. Administrative quality should figure in the evaluation of the forensics director, and it can be assessed by requesting evaluations from the administrative officials to whom one reports or with whom one works. There are no standardized instruments for this evaluation at present; some may have to be developed if deemed desirable.

CONCLUSIONS

One other point should be mentioned. This paper makes no specific reference to issues of promotion or tenure as they affect secondary school teachers, nor does the accompanying document on promotion and tenure. It is possible that secondary school directors may well find useful guidelines to fit their circumstances. Other guidelines, such as those on publication, may be less appropriate. It was not the function of the work group to address the second problem, although some high school teachers may find this a useful document for encouraging recognition of the special role played by directors of forensics at the high school level.

The major product of the work group on promotion and tenure is the accompanying document and some resolutions which accompany it. This paper addressed the issues confronted by the work group, and the document on promotion and tenure is both consistent with the recommendations of the 1974 Sedalia Report, and an extension of that set of recommendations.

B. *Statement of Guidelines for the Evaluation of Forensic Educators*

PREAMBLE

Forensics is a uniquely valuable educational program for developing abilities of critical thinking, reflective judgment, and effective advocacy. It is most appropriately housed within a speech or communication department in which the forensics educator holds a regular faculty appointment and is eligible for reappointment, promotion, tenure, and merit salary increases in accordance with the normal procedures of the institution. Forensics education retains its highest value when it shares in the academic perspective of its institution and the benefits of collegial support. Because forensics is necessarily concerned with issues of public controversy, and forensics educators often assume public roles, the legal and procedural protection embodied in academic freedom and tenure are of special importance.

Forensics educators may be evaluated for purposes of annual review, reappointment, promotion, tenure, and merit salary increases. The objective of each review is to make judgments about the educator's past performance and future potential, not merely to count items within categories. The principles in this statement are applicable to each of these reviews, although some reviews cover a longer time span than others and there obviously will be different levels of expectation with the passage of time. In all reviews, however, the forensics assignment should be evaluated, since it is an important component of the educator's responsibilities.

Because the missions of colleges and universities vary, the weight assigned to each of the evaluation standards below will likewise vary. For the same reason, each institution has the affirmative responsibility to articulate its goals and objectives for forensics; this responsibility is best met through consultation with the forensics director at the time of appointment, with the results specified in writing and periodically reviewed. (If such discussions were not held at the time of appointment, they should begin now.)

THE CONTEXT OF EVALUATION

Forensics should be part of the faculty member's regular academic responsibility and should be evaluated accordingly. Institutions should develop a statement which addresses the goals of the forensics program and its role in the educational mission of the institution. This statement should be used as a basis for determining the proportion of the faculty member's time and effort assigned to forensics. This proportion should be determined in consultation with the forensics educator, should be stated in writing, and should be reviewed each year in light of institutional objectives, personnel needs, and resources. Historically, instructional and service functions associated with forensics have not been given adequate weight in these assessments. Evaluation of the forensics components of the educator's duties should be conducted with reference to the proportion of effort assigned to these activities.

Basic to the evaluation process is the need for adequate information about the faculty member's activities. In the case of the forensics educator, activity reports for the forensics *program* should supplement standard individual *vitae* or reports of professional activities. To this end, forensics educators should prepare and submit annual reports, should meet with departmental or institutional administrators to discuss policy issues, and should engage in periodic review and self-evaluation of their forensics programs.

The mutually-understood proportionate weighting of forensics within an educator's total effort and the periodic assembly of relevant information shape the context in which evaluation occurs. This context will help to establish the pattern of performance necessary to build a case for favorable evaluation. Moreover, it will give the forensics educator an equitable opportunity to meet the institutional standards for review and participate fully in the normal role of faculty member.

STANDARDS AND CRITERIA

Forensics educators should be evaluated according to the same standards as other faculty—teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service, to the degree to which each is appropriate to the mission of the individual college or university. They should satisfy each standard at the same level of *quality* expected of other faculty. Typically, forensics responsibilities do not fit neatly into any one of these traditional categories but cut across all three. Therefore, forensics educators may differ from other faculty in the *amounts* of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service. Moreover, the criteria for determining whether standards are met may distinguish forensics educators from other faculty. The sections below suggest criteria for evaluating whether one's work in forensics meets each of the standards.

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING TEACHING IN FORENSICS

Forensics teaching is conducted in a variety of settings outside the classroom, ranging from informal tutorials to formal contests, and is often conducted during evenings, weekends, and vacation periods. Forensics educators should be evaluated on this component of their teaching as well as their classroom teaching. Depending on the mission of the institution and its stated goals for the forensics program, some or all of the following criteria may be employed.

Peer evaluation. Forensics educators should be evaluated by their forensics colleagues—codirectors, assistant directors, and graduate students—in their own institutions. This evaluation should be a well-established and ongoing cumulative process which preserves the anonymity of evaluators and which establishes evidence of a consistent pattern of forensics teaching. Such evaluations should be conducted by both current and former colleagues.

Forensics educators interact frequently at tournaments and conferences with their peers at other institutions, and they evaluate each others' students at these same events. Teaching therefore can be evaluated by peers within the field as well as at the home institution. External reviewers can assess the forensics educator's competence in critiquing and evaluating students from other schools, coaching at tournaments, tournament administration, and demonstrated forensics knowledge.

Letters from external reviewers, some nominated by the forensics educator and some by the review committee, should be solicited. The review committee should supply evaluators with information about the scope and objectives of the forensics program and the duties of the person being evaluated.

Student evaluation. Forensics activities are more like directed studies or independent research than regular academic classes. Student evaluations of teaching in these activities should be considered in the review of the forensics educator. There should be a regular ongoing cumulative process of student evaluations of the forensics teaching capacities of the forensics educator. Such evaluations should be scrutinized carefully for reliability and validity and should be used especially to identify consistent patterns of forensics teaching.

The number of students in a forensics program, number of tournaments or activities attended, number of events sponsored, or number of trophies won are not in themselves reliable indicators of the quality of forensics teaching. The meaningfulness of such data must be determined in the context of the goals and support system of the specific forensic program.

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY IN FORENSICS

In addition to normal indices of scholarly and creative activity, forensics educators should be evaluated on activity especially related to forensics. The key test of scholarly and creative activity is not its amount but its weight—its impact in shaping the discipline and related fields. Indicators of impact include the judgment of peers, receipt of awards and recognition, acceptance of competitive or refereed submissions, acceptance by ERIC, a pattern of frequent citation by others in the field, and the individual's development of a sustained program of inquiry. Depending on the mission of the institution and its stated goals for the forensics program, some or all of the following criteria might be employed:

1. Publication in forensics and other appropriate journals, with special attention to refereed journals.
2. Presentations at conventions, conferences, and similar forums, and participation in these events. Because of the rapidity of changes in the field, such attendance and participation are essential means for remaining abreast of current developments.
3. Publication of books, textbooks, non-print media, or other forms of instructional materials.
4. Book reviews.
5. Editing or refereeing for scholarly journals.
6. Development or criticism of argument in the public forum, such as political debate, governmental affairs, and economic and social issues.
7. Creative or artistic productions.

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING SERVICE TO FORENSICS

The nature of the instructional responsibilities in forensics dictates that service functions demand a greater portion of time than for the typical faculty member, often involving evenings, weekends, and vacation periods. Even though these demands are extensive, the forensics educator still must be provided the opportunity for participating in the normal service functions of the typical faculty member, such as service as a graduate advisor or member of major departmental and campus committees.

Forensic service may be evaluated in four categories:

1. Administrative duties. This category requires special consideration for the unique responsibilities associated with forensics programs, beyond the typical faculty member's role. Forensics educators may be responsible for recruiting students, arranging the logistics of travel, accounting for expenditures, budgeting, policy decisions regarding program activities, supervision and coordination of assistants within the program, scheduling of student activities, hosting high school and college tournaments, festivals, workshops, and summer institutes, preparation of annual reports and publicity releases, and other public relations activities.

2. Professional activities. The forensics educator should participate in the life of the profession, including membership in professional organizations, service on committees and in offices of those organizations, and service on editorial boards.

3. Service within the college and university community. Forensics educators coordinate public forums, debate demonstrations, radio and television programming to campus audiences. In addition, particular competencies such as leadership skills and knowledge of parliamentary procedure may lead to extensive consultation or service with campus organizations, governance activities, and workshops for staff or student groups.

4. Public service. The forensics program is often a major source of a department's external visibility. Forensics educators' activities include organizing and presenting programs to groups in high schools and in the community, judging high school forensics events, judging activities sponsored by service clubs such as Kiwanis, the American Legion, or the League of Women Voters. They may also be involved in consulting with various external public and private organizations.

C. RESOLUTIONS

4. DEPARTMENTAL OR INSTITUTIONAL ADMINISTRATORS, TOGETHER WITH THEIR FORENSIC DIRECTORS, SHOULD REVIEW SECRETARIAL, STAFF, AND OTHER SUPPORT SERVICES AVAILABLE TO FORENSICS, TO ASSURE THAT FORENSICS RECEIVES ADEQUATE SUPPORT TO ENABLE THE DIRECTOR TO DISCHARGE ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITIES. THIS PROCESS IS ESPECIALLY IMPORTANT IN CASES IN WHICH GRADUATE STUDENTS OR PART-TIME STAFF CARRY PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITIES.

In order to meet their forensics responsibilities and also to participate fully in the role of faculty members, forensics educators must have adequate support for their programs. Resources are misused if professionals are expected to perform substantial clerical duties. This support is even more urgent when forensics educators who are not regular faculty members find it difficult to command institutional resources or to develop the necessary authority or expertise to meet institutional requirements. Moreover, clerical duties should not be shouldered by those on part-time schedules with pressing responsibilities in their other roles.

5. THE FORENSIC EDUCATOR'S RESPONSIBILITIES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED PART OF THE NORMAL ACADEMIC ASSIGNMENT, NOT AS AN OVERLOAD.

Effective forensics teaching demands a faculty commitment just as does regular classroom instruction, scholarly and creative activity, and service. Professionals should not work more than 100% of the time. Forensics should not be assigned as an overload in addition to a normal academic assignment. The proportion of a faculty member's assignment should be developed through consultation between the department or institution and the forensics director.

6. PROFESSIONAL FORENSICS ORGANIZATIONS SHOULD STIMULATE, FUND, AND DISSEMINATE RESEARCH TO DEVELOP STANDARDIZED INSTRUMENTS TO ASSIST IN STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF FORENSICS TEACHING.

Standardized student evaluation forms are widely used—and frequently mandated—by institutions. Given the unique nature of the educational activities in forensics, an effort to develop standardized instruments appropriate to forensics is needed. Following the 1974 Sedalia Conference, Marilyn Young and her colleagues were commissioned to develop a prototype of such an instrument. This is a first step toward what is needed. Instruments must be evaluated for validity and reliability as well as face validity. Studies of various instruments should be undertaken with the results widely disseminated.

7. THE NATIONAL DEVELOPMENTAL CONFERENCE ON FORENSICS GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION OF FORENSICS EDUCATORS SHOULD BE SUBMITTED FOR ENDORSEMENT TO THE RELEVANT PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, SUCH AS THE ASSOCIATION FOR COMMUNICATION ADMINISTRATION, THE SPEECH COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION, AND THE PROFESSIONAL AND HONORARY FORENSICS ASSOCIATIONS.

The guidelines promulgated by this Conference will not only aid forensic directors but also provide guidance to the departments and institutions involved. They will carry greater weight if they are considered and endorsed by the major professional organizations.

8. THE ASSOCIATION FOR COMMUNICATION ADMINISTRATION SHOULD CREATE A CONSULTING SERVICE COMPOSED OF ACA MEMBERS WITH FORENSIC EXPERTISE TO ADVISE FORENSICS PERSONNEL, COMMUNICATION DEPARTMENTS, REVIEW COMMITTEES, AND COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS IN THE ASSIGNMENT AND EVALUATION PROCESS FOR FORENSICS EDUCATORS.

In the event that a department chairperson, college administrator, review committee, and/or forensics educator needs advice or arbitration in the development of models and methods of assigning and/or weighing criteria in evaluation discussions, an outside consultation may be sought. An ACA consulting service could serve this purpose and also add the credibility of an administrative perspective to the process.

D. STATEMENTS FROM POSITION PAPERS

DISCUSSION OF WHETHER TO RECOMMEND ADMINISTRATIVE CONTRACTS OR REGULAR TENURE-ELIGIBLE APPOINTMENTS.

KAROLYN YOCUM (CENTRAL MISSOURI STATE). An alternative to tenure and promotion might be to suggest the forensic program as a non-tenure track. Salary and increments could be based on productivity and evaluation on a year-to-year basis. Each institution could then create requirements, job descriptions, and evaluation procedures.

STEVE HUNT (LEWIS AND CLARK). . . . directors of forensics are really administrators now and deserve the long-term contracts and extra monies administrative contracts sometimes bring. After all, directors of forensics control a program and a budget. Often they coordinate forensics assistants. Forensics directors recruit. They have to be worried about publicity and public relations. Their calendar extends beyond the normal academic year because they deal with summer workshops, summer recruiting, and a policy topic that comes out in July. They deserve a ten-month contract and extra monies. . . .

DAVID ZAREFSKY (NORTHWESTERN). The most fundamental question is whether forensics coaches should occupy academic or administrative roles. The Sedalia conference *assumed* the former and called for the forensics program to be closely identified with the Department of Speech Communication. Hunt and Yocum at least raise the possibility of the latter scheme. If we endorse that approach, issues of promotion and tenure become moot. We need to decide whether to have a blanket endorsement of either of the roles, or to express a strong preference for one while acknowledging circumstances in which the other might be appropriate. . . . I believe we ought to come down strongly in favor of the academic role, on the grounds that, while the director of forensics entails significant administrative responsibility, the director is, first and foremost, a teacher and scholar. I also think it is a bad bargain to trade the rewards and security of tenure for freedom from pressures to do research. We probably should acknowledge, however, that there are some situations in which the administrative model is appropriate, particularly if an institution supports a forensics program but has no appropriate department to serve as its academic home. We should make clear, though, that conditions of this sort are clearly less than optimal.

DISCUSSION ON THE IMPORTANCE OF REGULAR REVIEW OF THE FORENSICS EDUCATOR

JEANINE CONGALTON (UTAH). Individuals must be cognizant of the consequences of accepting a position in which the guidelines for promotion and tenure either are not clarified or are perceived as incompatible with the coach's personal and professional expectations. . . . Moreover, forensics coaches must work to ensure that they are receiving credit for the many tasks which they perform.

KEN ANDERSEN (ILLINOIS). It seems that a forensics educator has the responsibility to keep his/her department appraised of the evolving nature of the forensics role. A new director may not know in the interview process what to bargain for. In any event, many directors, already in place, may find it valuable to inform their respective departments of their role as it currently stands. This can most beneficially occur if the department reviews the director and the program regularly.

DISCUSSION ON THE DIFFERENCES IN MISSION OF INSTITUTIONS

CRAIG DUDCZAK (OKLAHOMA). We should begin with a recognition that the mission of a college or university may vary considerably. As a consequence, the standard evaluation criteria for promotion and tenure—teaching, scholarship, and service—may be weighted differently from institution to institution.

ISA ENGLEBERG (PRINCE GEORGE'S COMMUNITY COLLEGE). One thing we should recognize is that the purpose of the community college may be considerably different than the four-year college. Teaching is the primary consideration for the two-year college. Scholarship may be nice, but the community college instructor who cannot teach effectively is not going to get rewarded through tenure and promotion. I suspect that the instructor at the four-year college, especially if it has a graduate program, can get tenure even with low teacher evaluation if he/she is producing publications.

DAVID ZAREFSKY (NORTHWESTERN). I do not believe that we can, or should, attempt to assign weights or priorities to the three standards (of teaching, scholarship, and service); they will be determined by the nature and aspirations of the individual institutions. For example, schools which consider themselves major research universities will place far more emphasis on contributions to the discipline than will many community colleges or four-year small colleges.

THE CONTEXT OF EVALUATION

DISCUSSION ON RECOGNIZING EVALUATION OF FORENSICS AS PROPORTIONATE TO THE FORENSICS ASSIGNMENT

MARILYN YOUNG (FLORIDA STATE). . . . the weight given by promotion and tenure committees to the forensics coach will vary with the degree of commitment the institution has to the program. That commitment is expressed in various ways, including financial support and faculty time. The more faculty time assigned to forensics, the more weight assessment of the quality of the forensics program will carry.

CRAIG DUDCZAK (OKLAHOMA). The premise for evaluating forensics educators' unique responsibilities should be based on a concept of "equity." By this I mean that the nature of the assignment should determine the appropriate standards for evaluation of tenure and promotion. Perhaps an analogy would clarify this. If an instructor were hired as a "research professor," then the evaluation of that professor's contribution to the field should reflect a heavier weighting toward scholarship in the evaluation process. Similarly, a forensics educator accepts a special "teaching" role in discharging his/her responsibilities. Hence, the evaluation of the forensic educator should reflect a weighting of "teaching" in evaluation for promotion and tenure. Just as it would be inequitable to evaluate the research professor on a standard criteria of teaching, scholarship, and service which undervalues the greater contributions to scholarship, it would be equally inequitable to evaluate forensics educators on criteria which were not reflective of the special teaching functions performed by the forensics educator.

STEVE HUNT (LEWIS & CLARK). Academics are trained to evaluate teaching, scholarship, and college service and forensics administration and coaching don't conveniently fit into the evaluation schemata. In fact, they are often counterproductive to the traditional criteria.

JEANINE CONGALTON (UTAH). . . . forensics coaches must work to ensure that they are receiving credit for the many tasks which they perform. When the forensics specialist is called upon to serve numerous roles, ranging from coach to administrator, then some value should be placed upon all of the tasks which a forensics coach carries out. Evaluation committees should be made aware the totality of a forensics coach's responsibilities. Only then, will forensics educators be given credit for the many tasks which they are called upon to perform.

STANDARDS AND CRITERIA

DISCUSSION DIFFERENTIATING STANDARDS FROM CRITERIA

STEVE HUNT (LEWIS & CLARK). If directors of forensics can sell their case as teachers and college community servants, which I think they can through quantifying the many hours they put in and through showing that this is quality work through teaching and service evaluations, and if directors of forensics can get decent release time and/or assistance, then directors of forensics will look very good on two out of the three traditional areas for promotion and tenure. Weight these two areas a bit extra heavily and give the director of forensics a small break in the scholarly area by reducing normal publication requirements and by maintaining a slightly broader definition of scholarship than just juried or refereed papers and directors of forensics could be getting quite a fair shake with regards to promotion and tenure.

DAVID ZAREFSKY (NORTHWESTERN). I would dispute the language—though not, I think, the sentiment—of Hunt's plea for forensics directors to receive "a small break" in the evaluation process. We will always be seen as "second-class citizens" if we foster the impression that we somehow can't meet the presumably more rigorous promotion and tenure standards expected of our colleagues. I propose that we take the following two positions: (1) Forensics educators can and should meet the same *standards* for promotion and tenure as do their colleagues. (2) The *criteria* for determining whether standards are met must necessarily vary with the nature of the faculty position.

My sense of the appropriate standards is not novel, for I am comfortable with the traditional three: quality of teaching, quality of contributions to the discipline, and service to the institutional and professional communities. The recognition that forensics specialists are educators argues for the first standard. My argument for the second is found in Congalton's discussion of the need to stay abreast of one's field and my own belief that one cannot really do that unless one contributes to it as well. The third standard is grounded in the belief that forensics educators are citizens of their institutions and in a position to provide leadership and service to their profession. . . .

It is reasonable for the institution to weight the director's review according to post-tenure distributions of effort, provided that (1) the faculty member is so advised at the time of appointment, and (2) those components which carry greater weight in the review than in the individual's *current* distribution of effort are evaluated primarily on qualitative rather an quantitative grounds. . . . This sort of system would balance fairness to the individual's current distribution of effort with an evaluation of the content of expected future distribution.

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING TEACHING IN FORENSICS

A. *Peer Evaluations*

JEANINE CONGALTON (UTAH). In the past it has been suggested that "classroom students, team members, and relevant faculty members all have input into evaluation processes." While each of these groups of people are important in determining the effectiveness of the forensics educator, additional support should come from outside the university as well. . . . Formal evaluation could be made by the forensics educator's peers which would help to counsel committees on promotion and tenure. For example, evaluations may come from members of the district committee or from coaches who are familiar with a forensics educator's work.

KAROLYN YOCUM (CENTRAL MISSOURI STATE). Other evaluation might be through letters of support from students and colleagues in the forensics community.

CRAIG DUDCZAK (OKLAHOMA). Outside evaluations tend to be undervalued in promotion and tenure decisions. Emmert reports that for all colleges and universities, outside evaluations were ranked ninth (of nine categories) as criteria for consideration in such decisions. Even in two-year colleges they were only ranked an average of sixth in their importance.

B. *Student Evaluations*

MARILYN YOUNG (FLORIDA STATE). Student ratings of instructional performance provide an objective assessment by those persons most directly affected—the students; and despite suspicions to the contrary, their reliability over time is very good, within certain parameters. The difficulty in using student ratings to evaluate forensics coaches is the lack of a tested instrument.

STEVE HUNT (LEWIS & CLARK). The director of forensics is also a teacher when serving as a critic judge. His or her oral evaluations and ballots can be evaluated by other directors of forensics and by their students. We almost always already have student evaluations of a director of forensics as coach by students from his/her own school and there are few reasons why we couldn't get similar evaluations from students and directors from other schools of the director of forensics as critic/judge.

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY IN FORENSICS

ISA ENGLEBERG (PRINCE GEORGE'S COMMUNITY COLLEGE). Unlike the fine arts instructor, there are no formal mechanisms for forensics criticism or evaluation. There is no equivalent to the art, music, or theatre critic. . . . It is arguable that the forensics coach's function is much like the theatre or art museum director's.

DAVID ZAREFSKY (NORTHWESTERN). Forensics educators are needlessly defensive about contributions to the discipline, insisting that they would like to do it but don't have the time. I am unpersuaded. Time will affect the *amount* one can contribute, but whether one does so or not is primarily a matter of motivation and will. Moreover, I believe that forensic educators do contribute to their discipline, although we are not as sensitive to some of the methods as we should be.

KENNETH ANDERSEN (ILLINOIS). When you look at the profile of the young academic, one thing which shows up time and again is a pattern of behavior. If a person doesn't make contributions when he/she is first starting out, it is not likely that contributions to the discipline will be forthcoming later. On the other hand, a record of scholarship early in one's career is usually a pretty good indicator of the prospect for future contributions. Review committees are sensitive to this fact and they make evaluations accordingly.

CRAIG DUDCZAK (OKLAHOMA). I think that a case can be made for considering conference and convention papers with greater weight in forensics than they would count more generally in the field of academia. The reason is that there is a rapid expansion of theory about forensics whereby competitively selected papers represent an appropriate means of addressing them. The interaction which accompanies these convention papers itself serves as one means of disseminating information. Further, both through the competitive process of selection as well as through the rigor of post-convention screening for inclusion in data banks like ERIC—which I understand to have a 50% rejection rate—there are suitable checks on quality.

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING SERVICE TO FORENSICS

STEVE HUNT (LEWIS & CLARK). Administering the forensics program, recruiting speakers' bureaus and/or public forums, publicity and public relations are all kinds of service to the college community. It is not too difficult to equate these services to community service in general and to on-campus committee and departmental service.

JEANINE CONGALTON (UTAH). . . . forensics coaches are often called upon or elected to serve at various capacities within their respective districts. Additionally, many of these same educators have been appointed to national committees. Such time and effort should not go unrewarded, especially when many of these committees are vital to the livelihood of the activity. . . .

He/she must be adept at administrative responsibilities as well. Thus, we find that the forensics educator's work include trying to operate within budgets, making arrangements for hosting tournaments, running tournaments, and working as a recruiter. While these tasks are inherent within the job of a forensics educator, we should work to ensure that proper credit is given for these many roles which must be performed.

DAVID ZAREFSKY (NORTHWESTERN). Virtually all forensics professionals will distinguish themselves on the standard of service, once it is made clear what criteria may be appropriately employed. In addition to the usual participation on school and college committees, forensics directors serve their institutions in their administrative roles. These are well-documented in several of the position papers, and they range from liason with the Admissions Office to mounting budgets. Administrative quality should figure in the evaluation of the forensics director, and it can be assessed by requesting evaluations from the administrative officials to whom one reports or with whom one works. Service to the professional community should include leadership roles in the major professional organizations and their committees. It also includes editing journals, or newsletters, hosting tournaments or workshops, directing, hosting or serving on the policy-making committees of the major national tournaments or the various district tournaments. We have no dearth of opportunities for professional service. Effectiveness in this capacity could be assessed both by the frequency with which one is asked to perform this role and by evaluations requested of the organizers and key officials of the various organizations and groups.

Chapter V
Strengthening Educational Goals and Programs

A. *Forensic Directors as Professional Educators*

George Ziegelmueller and Donn W. Parson

INTRODUCTION

That forensics is an educational activity is clear from Chapter II, the Rationale for Forensics. In fact, forensic educators constantly make decisions about programs and activities based on the educational values of the director. The Committee on Educational Goals attempted to articulate a number of the goals associated with forensics. While the goals and objectives cited here are not meant to be exhaustive, they do give a broad perspective on the types of objectives which can be achieved through instruction in forensics. These goals include the acquisition of skills in the evaluation and testing of arguments through rigorous analysis, and in the construction of arguments through synthesis. They include the development of ethical standards of conduct and of corresponding cooperative and competitive attitudes and behaviors. Goals would include research skill development and the investigation of current issues, as well as aesthetic appreciation and understanding. Specific goals for behavioral skills would include improved listening, organization, language use and presentational style.

The Committee also specified a number of possible outcomes for the participant in forensics. Such outcomes included aesthetic and argumentative appreciation, skills in critical thinking, information processing and leadership, understanding of current issues, improved reasoning and greater self-actualization. To the extent programs provide opportunities for students to achieve these outcomes, programs then may be said to be educationally oriented.

It may be that goal setting is not enough. In addition, the forensic director should examine learner outcomes and attempt to measure the extent to which the goals are achieved. The forensic director is faced with decisions which have important ramifications for accomplishing those values which students should receive. When decisions about the program are made with specific goals in mind, the direction of the program will have an educational focus. It is the belief of the Committee on Educational Goals that every decision should be made from this perspective.

The efforts in this chapter actually reflect the work of two separate committees. One committee, on Educational Goals, made a number of recommendations from the perspective of the goals orientation. A second committee, on Strengthening and Expanding Forensic Programs, made a series of specific recommendations on ways to expand and improve programs, resolutions which were consistent with the Educational Goals Committee. Because both committees were concerned with educational goals and behaviors, and both committees made recommendations for actions to achieve these goals, the combined efforts of both committees are reflected in this chapter.

There are four major areas of resolutional focus: (1) Forensic Educators as Professionals; (2) Administrative Support for Forensics; (3) The Role of Professional Forensics Organizations; and (4) Forensic Tournament Directors.

FORENSIC EDUCATORS AS PROFESSIONALS

Forensic educators are required to fulfill a number of differing professional roles, among them the role of classroom teacher, program administrator, and student adviser. Each one of these roles carries with it certain obligations. While the Conference did not attempt to address itself to all the various roles and responsibilities of forensic educators, it did seek to highlight certain areas of special concern. The recommendations from the work groups on Educational Goals and

Strengthening and Expanding Programs are intended to remind the coach of the need to monitor carefully the behavior of those associated with the program—both assistant coaches and students—and to give primacy to educational objectives in all aspects of forensic activities. The Conference did not feel that coaches were unaware of these obligations, but wanted to establish the importance of setting appropriate priorities.

Because participation in forensics is extremely demanding of students' time and energies, the Conference recognized that forensic participants will sometimes neglect their class work in favor of forensic efforts and that they may become overly dependent on packaged materials. The recommendations of the Conference place a clear responsibility on forensic educators to guard against such excesses.

As directors of programs, it is easy for forensic directors to get caught up in the details of administration and lose sight of their central role as educators. Thus, the Conference urged forensic instructors to carefully balance their various roles. It also called for balanced instruction in both the oral and written aspects of argument.

ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT FOR FORENSICS

The statement of rationale adopted by the conference includes the comment, "Forensics remains an ongoing, scholarly experience, uniting students and teachers in its basic educational purpose." As such, the activity and its educators have a direct responsibility to the department or administrative unit of which they are a part. That responsibility is reciprocal, however, and the conference wished to underscore the importance of that relationship.

One of the central concerns of the Sedalia Conference of 1974 was this relationship between the department and the forensic program. Recommendations from the Sedalia Report called for all institutions to maintain a forensic program, for teacher-training programs to include formal instruction in forensics and for institutions offering doctoral degrees in communication to support active programs in forensics.[1] The National Conference of 1984 echoed these resolves.

Given increasing budget constraints, Conference participants evidenced concern that fiscal restrictions might curtail or even end valuable programs in forensics. There was some concern that increased specialization in graduate programs may reduce rather than increase training for students desiring to become active directors of forensics. To this end, one resolution was proposed encouraging speech communication departments to maintain forensic programs and provide opportunity for the training of future forensic directors. The Conference also urged that adequate compensation be provided for the forensic teacher.

A second concern was the tendency of some institutions for forensics coaches to be treated as part time faculty, para-professionals or as members of a support staff rather than as regular faculty members who are central to the educational mission of the institution. While this tendency is not wide-spread, the Conference affirmed that the person in charge of directing any forensics program should be a fully qualified member of the faculty, subject to the same opportunities and rewards as other professionals. Methods of evaluating the forensics director have been spelled out in Chapter IV on promotion and tenure, but both the work groups on Educational Goals and on Strengthening and Expanding Forensic Programs recommended that forensics be seen as an integral part of a department of speech communication and its director as a fully qualified part of the educational staff.

ROLE OF PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

In the ten years since the 1974 Sedalia Conference concluded, there has been a large increase in the number of forensic organizations. Many of these organizations have been designed for a specific activity, such as policy debate, or value debate, or individual events. As the number of activities has increased, so too has the number of forensic organizations concerned with those activities.

---

[1] James H. McBath, Ed., *Forensics as Communication: The Argumentative Perspective*, pp. 45-46.

The sheer number of organizations has created problems in overlapping and competing domains. The work group on Inter-organizational Cooperation made a single recommendation for coordination of these organizations. While such coordination may make it easier to improve forensics, the work groups on Strengthening and Expanding Programs and on Educational Goals identified a number of areas in which specific recommendations could be undertaken by a variety of organizations to improve forensics.

Two of the primary functions of professional organizations in forensics are those of public relations and professional relations. The way in which forensic activities are understood and appreciated by our colleagues and the public at large reflects efforts in the area of public relations. The way in which forensic activities are sponsored, evaluated, modified and improved is one of the tasks of professional relations.

One persistent problem cited by the work groups is the need for additional research. Such research can identify demographic characteristics of participants, long and short range benefits of participation, skills acquired and specific variables which influence whether programs are modified or even continued. One resolution called for professional organizations to identify ethnic, racial, gender and handicap barriers which might prevent participation in forensics. Remedial steps properly need adequate prior research to determine the nature of the problem.

Generally the work groups felt the need for professional organizations to provide counsel to new coaches and leadership in advancing forensic skills at all levels of education, especially in elementary and junior high schools. They also encouraged increased efforts to make forensic activities visible to the public at large, including activities in public campaigns and public presentations of televised debates and speech performances. The work group recommended that an annual National Public Issues Conference be held where forensic students can interact with public leaders and policy area experts on issues considered during the debate season.

Finally the work groups recommended that professional organizations work to improve the quality of forensic coaching and judging through conferences and periodicals. This even included a recommendation for a new pedagogy publication in forensics.

FORENSIC TOURNAMENT DIRECTORS

Forensic tournaments are laboratories for both debate and contest speaking. The tournament setting provides opportunities for coaches and students to experiment with new ideas, new strategies, and new procedures, and for students to test their understanding and skills against others. Given the central role of tournaments in forensics education, it was inevitable that numerous resolutions of the Conference should be addressed to tournament directors.

A major concern of many college level debate and individual event coaches has been the question of how to attract greater numbers of inexperienced students into the activity. Individuals with little or no high school experience in forensics are often intimidated by peers who have had extensive forensics training at the high school level. An Action Caucus was formed to address this problem and a resolution approved by the Conference Assembly urged expanding opportunities for novice participants.

The report of the 1974 Developmental Conference on Forensics contained resolutions calling for experimentation with new formats and activities and for greater research into the effects of particular forensic practices. The 1984 Conference again endorsed these ideas. New events and formats have the potential for attracting additional students, enriching the learning experience, and providing more fair and stimulating environments.

One of the most controversial resolutions approved by the Developmental Conference called for greater reliance on random systems of judge assignment. Proponents of the resolution argued that random selection is the only objective means of judge assignment. They argued, further, that random assignment is fairer and helps to counteract many of the negative communication habits currently exhibited. Opponents argued that student preference sheets are a fair means of judge selection and that students generally prefer to select their judges.

B. RESOLUTIONS

1. *Resolutions Concerning Forensic Directors*

9. FORENSIC DIRECTORS SHOULD CONSCIENTIOUSLY FULFILL THEIR ROLES AS BOTH TEACHERS OF STUDENTS AND ADMINISTRATORS OF PROGRAMS BY:
    1. Conducting systematic and formal instruction as well as coaching in forensics.
    2. Planning and carefully managing administrative tasks necessary to an efficient forensic program.
    3. Achieving a balance between the roles of teacher and administrator.

The forensic director must do more than simply serve as an administrator or an advisor for students. The director must be responsible for either the direct instruction of forensic skills or must establish goals and instruction to assure that others under his/her direction are providing quality instruction for students. Directors need to achieve a balance between the roles as teacher and as administrator through an awareness of the obligation to execute and to delegate tasks associated with those roles.

10. FORENSIC EDUCATORS SHOULD DESIGN COURSES IN FORENSICS IN THE ACADEMIC CURRICULUM. THESE COURSES SHOULD BOTH SERVE THE PURPOSE OF PROMOTING TRAINING FOR FUTURE FORENSIC EDUCATORS AND OF PROVIDING DIMENSIONS OF FORENSIC RELATED GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR STUDENTS WITHIN A CURRICULAR, AS OPPOSED TO A CO-CURRICULAR, FRAMEWORK.

Forensic educators should provide curricular material to aid in the preparation of those students who may later serve as forensic educators. Further, forensic educators should develop courses which can serve to expose all students to the educational values of forensic activities, even for students who may not wish to avail themselves of opportunities in co-curricular or extra-curricular forensic programs.

11. FORENSIC EDUCATORS SHOULD ENSURE THAT STUDENT PARTICIPANTS ASSUME PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY FOR INDEPENDENT RESEARCH AND INVENTION OF ARGUMENT. FOR EXAMPLE, FORENSIC EDUCATORS SHOULD INFORM STUDENTS REGARDING ACCEPTABLE PROCEDURES IN THE CREATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF ARGUMENT EARLY EACH YEAR; SHOULD DISCOURAGE THE DEPENDENCE UPON "CANNED" MATERIALS, SUCH AS DEBATE HANDBOOKS, PRE-CUT INTERPRETATION SELECTIONS, AND BRIEFS PREPARED BY PERSONS OTHER THAN THE COMPETITORS USING THEM; SHOULD NOT ALLOW STUDENTS TO USE SPEECHES OR INTERPRETATION CUTTINGS PREPARED TO ANY SIGNIFICANT DEGREE BY SOMEONE ELSE WHEN COMPETING IN ORIGINAL EVENTS OR INTERPRETATION EVENTS.

Quality instruction emphasizes teaching students how to master tasks and acquire skills. While coaches are encouraged to demonstrate how to research, create, and develop arguments, and to provide examples of quality arguments or readings to the students, the coaches should not do the work for the student.

12. FORENSIC EDUCATORS SHOULD FOSTER THE DEVELOPMENT OF BOTH ORAL AND WRITTEN ARGUMENTATIVE SKILLS.

Forensic students spend a great deal of effort in the accumulation of evidence and the independent creation of written documents. It is important that forensic educators regularly monitor and critique the development of associated skills. Although written efforts are usually designed with a concern for oral presentation, maximum educational benefits necessitate close contact with students through all stages of the forensic enterprise.

13. FORENSIC EDUCATORS SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTIVELY MONITORING THE FORENSIC PEDAGOGICAL ACTIVITIES OF ALL PROGRAM ASSISTANTS AND PARTICIPANTS. DIRECTORS SHOULD INFORM STUDENTS AND ASSISTANTS REGARDING APPROPRIATE BEHAVIORS EARLY IN THE SEASON, AND ACTIVELY SEEK TO PROMOTE THOSE BEHAVIORS THROUGHOUT THE PROGRAM.

The forensic director may delegate responsibility for some of the necessary education tasks. They may be delegated to graduate students, former participants, and advanced students who serve as coaches and judges. Since these individuals affect the students they are teaching and reflect on the program, the forensic director should accept the responsibility for the behaviors of those associated with the forensic program.

14. FORENSIC EDUCATORS SHOULD PROMOTE BEHAVIORS IN STUDENTS AND A COMMUNICATIVE CLIMATE WHICH EMPHASIZE COOPERATION WITH AND RESPECT FOR OTHER COMPETITORS, JUDGES, AND OTHER FORENSIC ACTIVITIES.

While competition will always remain an essential focus of forensics, educators should take steps to teach concomitant values of cooperation and respect toward others. In a world whose prosperity and survival depend on people's ability to effectively manage their diverse needs and aspirations, the forensic activity should utilize practices which teach cooperative skills and maintain an atmosphere in forensics which reminds students that other competitors are persons to be respected and not objects to be defeated.

15. FORENSIC EDUCATORS SHOULD STATE AND MAINTAIN ENROLLMENT EXPECTATIONS AND REQUIRE A MINIMUM "C" AVERAGE (2.0 ON A 4.0 SCALE OR EQUIVALENT) TO PROMOTE THE STUDENTS' TOTAL EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE DURING PARTICIPATION IN FORENSIC ACTIVITIES.

Forensic educators should ensure that student enrollment patterns will not be dictated solely by the competitive dimensions of the forensic program. They should be cognizant of their students' grade point averages, and the number of classes missed by forensic competitors. Students who fail to meet minimum grade point standards should be ineligible to participate in forensic activities until grade point standards have been met. All national organizations which sponsor national tournaments should set minimum academic standards for participation at their tournaments.

16. FORENSIC EDUCATORS SHOULD INITIATE AND ENCOURAGE PARTICIPATION IN ONGOING FORUMS OF FORENSIC ACTIVITIES THAT ARE AVAILABLE TO CAMPUS AND COMMUNITY AUDIENCES.

Most forensic students practice their communicative abilities in situations associated with a restricted and often highly specialized audience. By systematically pursuing opportunities available for public presentation of forensic activities, students will gain greater appreciation of the various ways in which the general public processes arguments and can acquire a sensitivity to adaptation in communication. Programs can gain increased exposure on campus and in the community.

2. *Resolutions Concerning Administrative Support*

17. ALL SPEECH COMMUNICATION DEPARTMENTS SHOULD DEVELOP AND MAINTAIN FORENSIC PROGRAMS. ALL GRADUATE LEVEL INSTITUTIONS SHOULD PROVIDE TRAINING FOR STUDENTS WHO DESIRE TO UNDERTAKE CAREERS IN FORENSIC EDUCATION. ALL SPEECH COMMUNICATION DEPARTMENTS SHOULD ENCOURAGE AND REWARD PROGRAMMATIC RESEARCH IN ARGUMENTATIVE DISCOURSE.

Forensic participation is an integral part of a program of study in communication for students in elementary, secondary, and undergraduate college programs. The training of future forensic educators should be a part of the curriculum of undergraduate and graduate study in communication. Research into the theory and practice of argumentative discourse is essential to the continued well-being of our democratic society and to the peaceful resolution of conflicts.

18. THE PERSON IN CHARGE OF DIRECTING A PROGRAM OF HIGH SCHOOL AND COLLEGE FORENSIC ACTIVITIES OUGHT TO BE A FULLY QUALIFIED MEMBER OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF OF THE SCHOOL.

An increasing number of high school forensic programs are not directed by fully qualified instructional staff members. They may be directed by undergraduate college students, still quite near their own competitive years. These para-professionals, without baccalaureate degrees, are not prepared to guide forensic programs. In order to provide greater educatonal opportunity for the forensic student, and support for the forensic educator, teachers should be fully qualified members of the instructional staff.

19. FORENSIC EDUCATORS SHOULD BE PROPERLY COMPENSATED, BOTH IN WORK LOAD REDUCTION AND SALARY.

Forensic educators provide vital, meaningful learning experiences for their students. However, the work load of the forensic teacher is frequently increased by travel time to tournaments, student contact hours, and subject matter preparation. When the forensic teacher is not given either reduced work load or compensation for these matters, the program suffers, and promotes unnecessarily high turnover of forensic educators.

3. *Resolutions Concerning Professional Organizations*

20. THE AMERICAN FORENSIC ASSOCIATION SHOULD SIGNIFICANTLY EXPAND ITS MISSION OF PROMOTING FORENSIC EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND SERVICE. THE AFA SHOULD SERVE ALL FORENSIC ORGANIZATIONS BY PROMOTING FORENSIC EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND SERVICE AT A VARIETY OF SOCIETAL LEVELS, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO: HIGH SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS, HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER CERTIFICATION BOARDS, PUBLIC SCHOOL ACCREDITATION AGENCIES, COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATORS, COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ACCREDITATION AGENCIES, STATE AND NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATIONS, PARENT-TEACHER ORGANIZATIONS, BUSINESS INSTITUTIONS, AND GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES.

The key to strengthening and expanding forensic education, research, and service is to strengthen the public image of these pursuits. Forensic teachers and students are too often hidden from the public, and forensic research does not enjoy public dissemination. Forensic service can include consulting and aiding in political campaigns, public policy decision making among others. The value of forensics needs to be promoted to society in general and specific groups within society.

21. PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS IN FORENSICS SHOULD WORK TO:
    1. Provide information to new coaches and be available to provide counsel;
    2. Provide leadership in advancing forensic skills and activities into all levels of education, especially at the elementary and junior high school levels;
    3. Provide visibility of forensic activities by establishing channels to public decision making bodies, private organizations, public campaigns, including such areas as legal and business communication;
    4. Provide opportunities for public presentation of forensic activities by encouraging televised debates and performance, as well as print coverage.

Professional leadership is needed to increase visibility of forensic activities, and make the benefits and skills of those activities known in areas where they apply, such as business and government decision-making. These forensic organizations should explore channels to establish contact between forensics and related activities. They should also be available for new directors, providing information and counsel as needed.

22. THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES WITHIN ALL FORENSIC RELATED ORGANIZATIONS SHOULD PROVIDE INCENTIVE FOR AND ACTIVELY RECRUIT MEMBERS TO USE APPROPRIATE METHODOLOGY TO CONDUCT RESEARCH ON VITAL FORENSIC ISSUES INCLUDING:
    1. Identification of demographic characteristics of forensic participants;
    2. Long and short range benefits accrued from all forms of forensic participation;
    3. Effects on participants' skill development and scholarship of lengthy forensic season and time out of school for participants;
    4. Role delineation studies which identify a set of competencies for forensic educators;
    5. Relationship between forensics and critical thinking;
    6. Educational values accrued from various forensic events;
    7. Methods and sources of forensic program evaluation;
    8. Determination of variables which influence the continuation of programs.

Comparison of educational practices in forensics is hampered by the lack of base line data. Forensic educators often lack empirical data about a number of issues in forensics and, therefore, rely on convention or intuitive wisdom as a basis for forensic decisions and for discussions with administrators. Only through hard data can the forensic community formulate sound decisions, and the appropriate focus and impetus for such research should come from professional organizations.

23. THE AMERICAN FORENSIC ASSOCIATION SHOULD ESTABLISH A COMMITTEE GIVEN THE SPECIFIC CHARGE TO INCREASE AND STRENGTHEN FORENSIC PARTICIPATION BY IDENTIFYING ETHNIC, RACIAL, GENDER, AND HANDICAP BARRIERS WHICH MAY CURRENTLY INHIBIT STUDENT PARTICIPATION AND SHOULD DISSEMINATE FINDINGS CONCERNING SUCH BARRIERS THROUGHOUT THE FORENSIC COMMUNITY. THE COMMITTEE SHOULD CONSULT WITH STATE AND FEDERAL AFFIRMATIVE ACTION OFFICES TO INVESTIGATE THE PROBLEMS AND IMPLEMENT SOLUTIONS.

The benefits of forensics should be available to all persons regardless of ethnicity, race, gender, or handicaps. The argumentative and communicative skills fostered by forensics may be especially beneficial to certain groups who may not otherwise have the opportunity to develop these skills. While the 1974 Sedalia Conference recommended research to explore both minority and gender-based concerns, as yet no specific forum has been established within the forensic community to encourage such research and disseminate its findings.

24. THE FORENSIC COMMUNITY SHOULD SYSTEMATICALLY PROPOSE, IMPLEMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATE TOURNAMENT FORMATS, EVENTS, JUDGE ASSIGNMENT PROCEDURES, AND OTHER ASPECTS OF TOURNAMENT ADMINISTRATION AND DISSEMINATE THE RESULTS OF SUCH STUDIES. THE AMERICAN FORENSIC ASSOCIATION AND OTHER FORENSIC ORGANIZATIONS SHOULD FUND SUCH RESEARCH.

A Sedalia Conference resolution recommended "more frequent use of alternative events and formats." While new events and formats can enhance the educational value of forensics, innovation should not preclude evaluation of *current* events and formats. Tournament formats should increase access, promote socialization, maintain fairness, and enhance participant self-actualization. Present and future tournament events and formats should be assessed periodically to determine the extent to which they achieve educational values.

25. THE AMERICAN FORENSIC ASSOCIATION, IN CONCERT WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS, SHOULD INITIATE AN ONGOING PROGRAM OF UPGRADING AND ENHANCING THE QUALITY OF FORENSIC COACHING AND JUDGING.

Well intentioned coaches and judges may teach and evaluate forensics based on a lack of adequate information about the wide variety of forensic events. Forensic educators can benefit from periodic workshops to discuss problems and innovations in forensics. National organizations, as well as state and regional bodies, should systematically make available resources and informed training needed by forensic educators.

26. THE PROFESSIONAL FORENSIC ORGANIZATIONS SHOULD ENCOURAGE COLLEGES TO SPONSOR FORENSIC SIMULATIONS DESIGNED TO PREPARE STUDENTS FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE INSTITUTIONAL DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES IN SOCIETY. THE VIEW SHOULD BE PROMOTED THAT FORENSIC TOURNAMENTS ARE A LABORATORY FOR LEARNING AND TESTING COMMUNICATION SKILLS IN A VARIETY OF CONTEXTS AND SETTINGS. THE SPEECH COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION COMMISSSION ON LEGAL COMMUNICATION, THE CROSS EXAMINATION DEBATE ASSOCIATION, AND THE AMERICAN FORENSIC ASSOCIATION SHOULD ASSIST COLLEGES TO ESTABLISH TOURNAMENT COMPETITION IN LEGAL ARGUMENT. ADDITIONAL ANALOGUES SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED IN APPROPRIATE AREAS OF STUDENT INTEREST, INCLUDING BUSINESS COMMUNICATION, PUBLIC RELATIONS, POLITICAL SETTINGS AND OTHER AREAS.

The tournament setting provides a proven arena in which to motivate students and to enhance learning. The legal contest, as well as other analogues, are selected as reflecting growing student interest in such areas as law, business and public relations. The use of "real world" analogues would provide students with skills directly applicable to future communication needs. The forensic laboratory may, therefore, be more inviting to speech communication researchers interested in developing and testing hypotheses concerning applied communication.

27. THE FORENSIC COMMUNITY SHOULD ESTABLISH AN INTERORGANIZATIONAL COMMITTEE TO PLAN AND IMPLEMENT AN ANNUAL NATIONAL PUBLIC ISSUES CONFERENCE. THE CONFERENCE WOULD SHOWCASE THE FORENSIC PROCESS AND BRING TOGETHER FORENSIC STUDENTS, FOREN-

SIC EDUCATORS, AND PUBLIC LEADERS TO DEBATE AND DISCUSS VARIOUS POLICY AND VALUE CONTROVERSIES CONSIDERED DURING THE FORENSIC SEASON.

Each year forensic students gather a wealth of material on a variety of debate topics and subjects treated in extemporaneous, persuasive, and informative speaking. Much of this information could appropriately be shared with public policy decision makers. In addition to sharing information, participants would gain richer insight into the views of such public officials. The interaction would benefit the activity of forensics as well as better inform public policy decision makers.

28. THE COUNCIL OF FORENSIC ORGANIZATIONS SHOULD CONSIDER THE DEVELOPMENT OF AVENUES FOR THE PUBLICATION OF ARTICLES ON FORENSIC PEDAGOGY AT ALL LEVELS.

Although the theoretical and research orientation of the *Journal of the American Forensic Association* meets the need for scholarly work in the discipline of forensics, it does not offer a vehicle for highly practical articles explaining specific instructional and administrative techniques regarding debate and individual events. Publications containing such material would enhance the educational quality of forensics through assisting educators in planning for the instruction of students and the administration of programs.

4. *Resolutions Concerning Tournament Directors*

29. INNOVATION IN, AND AN INCREASE IN THE DIVERSITY OF, DEBATE FORMATS SHOULD BE ACCELERATED.

Academic debate has, with trivial exceptions, seen no change in format in the face of changing needs and interests. Although the Sedalia Conference highlighted the benefits of a variety of formats, the addition of cross-examination has been the only response. There is a good deal of discontent with the debating our current format produces. Any genuine concern for the vitality of debate must be reflected in a concern for the formats used.

Experience in individual events offers evidence of the ability of a variety of formats to meet differing educational goals. The innovation of CEDA debate is encouraging, but implements only a different kind of resolution. A variety of formats would allow different educational values to be met. One format may better teach research skills, another speaking skills. Variety in formats may increase student interest and participation. Opinions on format change should be elicited from debaters and coaches alike. Experimentation with formats can proceed with little risk in workshops and practice rounds. Promising innovations should be used in at least some rounds at major national tournaments, thus encouraging the entire forensic community to consider format changes and their educational benefits.

30. TOURNAMENT DIRECTORS ARE STRONGLY ENCOURAGED TO INCLUDE A NOVICE DIVISION AT ALL DEBATE AND INDIVIDUAL EVENTS TOURNAMENTS WHERE APPROPRIATE.

Students with strong backgrounds in debate and individual events find no problem adapting to their college forensic tournament challenges. Students with little or no prior experience do not find appropriate entry level divisions from which to gain that experience. Tournaments with novice divisions would aid entry level students and encourage more new students to participate. Students should not be classified as novices if they have more than a year of high school experience, and should not remain at the novice level longer than two semesters of college competition.

31. PROCEDURES EMPLOYED TO ASSIGN JUDGES TO CONTEST ROUNDS IN DEBATE AND INDIVIDUAL EVENTS SHOULD MINIMIZE, TO THE GREATEST EXTENT POSSIBLE, THE SUBJECTIVE EVALUATON OF JUDGES. RANDOM JUDGE PLACEMENT IS ENCOURAGED, WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT A JUDGE SHOULD NOT BE ASSIGNED TO JUDGE HIS/HER OWN STUDENTS, A STUDENT PREVIOUSLY JUDGED IN THE SAME EVENT, OR STUDENTS FROM OTHER SCHOOLS WHOM THAT JUDGE HAS PREVIOUSLY COACHED.

Receiving feedback from an inter-institutional faculty is an essential part of a student's forensic education. Students benefit most when they are exposed to a wide range of judging perspectives and are forced to learn how to adapt to these perspectives. In contrast, many of our student's negative communication habits are reinforced when they are judged only by those critics who are willing to accept such a communication style. Some judge assignment procedures currently in use may imply that some judges are superior to others when there are no objective criteria for making such judgments.

32. FORENSIC EDUCATORS SHOULD ACCEPT THE RESPONSIBILITY TO JUDGE A VARIETY OF FORENSIC EVENTS.

The primary responsibility for evaluating forensic contests should be shouldered by those persons who are trained in critical assessment of communicative acts. The forensic educator, having been trained in the activity, has the responsibility to evaluate forensic events and provide oral and/or written justificiation (as prescribed by the tournament) for the judgment rendered. The need for efficient tournament administration and competent feedback to participants demands that the forensic educator serve this function.

33. IN ORDER TO FOSTER STUDENTS' ABILITY TO ADAPT TO VARIOUS COMMUNICATION CONTEXTS, TOURNAMENT DIRECTORS SHOULD PROVIDE PREPARATION FOR AND UTILIZE COMMUNITY JUDGES IN FORENSIC EVENTS.

Forensic activities should teach students to adapt communication messages to different argumentative contexts and audiences. Analytical skills such as choice-making and presentational behaviors should reflect one's ability to adapt to varied situations. Adaptability to context and audiences is a central educational value of forensics. Tournaments can enhance this value through a greater diversity of judges.

C. STATEMENTS FROM POSITION PAPERS

NEIL PHILLIPS (UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA). In addition to becoming more aware of evaluating our practices, we must consider our reasons for the practices in the first place. What are we trying to accomplish and why? The Sedalia Conference recommended that we attempt to develop complete, humanistic advocates skilled in a variety of forums and on a variety of topics. How will we and our debaters know when this is accomplished? While I am not advocating a set of clearly delineated behavioral objectives, our lofty goal needs to be defined more specifically.

DEBORAH BALLARD-REINSCH (ST. OLAF COLLEGE). A diversified forensic program which integrates competition with campus and community activities will safeguard the future of forensics. In this time of economic hardship when many organizations are vying for a limited number of dollars, programs which can justify themselves to an administration only on the basis of competitive success will find their task more and more difficult. However, those programs which can explain their value in academic and community terms as well as competitive success will find their position more secure.

JAMES G. CANTRILL (UNIVERISITY OF ILLINOIS). Forensic directors should commit a portion of their time and effort to demonstrating to school administrators the value of forensic training in the development of the critical faculties. In situations where an institution requires the completion of a critical reasoning course for graduation, forensic participation should be promoted as a viable alternative.

RIPPLE RAUSCH (MERIDIAN JUNIOR COLLEGE). I believe that the failure of forensic coaches to carefully examine the amount of input *vs.* the amount of output as it affects educational value can lead to varying types of negative results (i.e., coach burn-out, mediocre or poor academic records by student participants, over-emphasis on one type of educational experience) . . . It is also my belief that we sometimes overdose on the activity. When overdose occurs, educational value decreases. For this reason, I think that all persons involved in forensics should be aware of and react to the law of diminishing returns.

CLARK OLSON (ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY). It is time to shed the term "extra-curricular" so that departments can see that forensics is an integral and necessary part of the offerings of a department, not only to put the department on the map competitively, but to provide a balanced educational opportunity for all interested students. Too often, forensics is made analogous to athletics, and many of us willingly buy into this analogy. But often, many fail to realize the many weaknesses in the analogy: that forensics is an intellectual, not an athletic activity, that forensics has its foundation in education, not competition.

GREGG WALKER (UNIVERSITY OF UTAH). We may believe that argumentation is central to debate, yet many debate students have a poor understanding of classical or comtemporary theories of argument. Our persuasive speakers and "analyzers" of communication, driven more by a quest for plastic trophies, may search for the most tournament-successful speech method rather than making strategic choices as a knowledgeable rhetor. While we should not expect our forensics students to be speech communication majors, students should learn more about rhetoric and communication through the activity than they seem to be learning at present.

MICHAEL BARTANEN (PACIFIC LUTHERAN UNIVERSITY). Perhaps no other single act could do more to bring debate back from the wilderness than simply acknowledging that delivery is an important aspect of argument and that debate critics have a responsibility to students to assist them in becoming more effective and eloquent presenters of their ideas. Students are responsive to feedback. If they are rewarded for fast delivery they will find ways of going faster. If they are rewarded for a comprehensible and persuasive delivery they will discover ways of being more comprehensible and persuasive.

WILLIAM HENDERSON (UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA). Debate is a very worthwhile activity, both in high school and college. But the activity is weighted down by overzealous professionalism. The resulting overcommitment of time by students and coaches generates a trend which may yield two very unhealthy worlds: one which is totally elite, responding only to the whims of the well-endowed programs of the nation, and the other consisting of the jolly travelers of the spring league. Absent external rules, which confine the activity to limited time and assistance to some sort of regulated service, the bipolarization will continue.

M. JACK PARKER (NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY). There is strong demand for the skills of legal advocacy. We are in a position to design the competitive program to teach such skills and it is reasonable for us as forensics teachers to supervise these activities. Adapting the traditional contest pedagogy to legal propositions can be undertaken immediately. But there are longer range goals which should be kept in mind . . . We should continue to develop the more elaborate competitions in mock trial and moot court, forging closer ties with the legal profession as we do so.

DON R. SWANSON (UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN COLORADO). There is also the implicit assumption that the forensic program must function as an open system. Those forensic programs that have attempted to function as a closed system have found it difficult to strengthen or to expand. A closed system has fixed boundaries which permit no interaction with its environment. Unfortunately, some forensic programs turn inward upon themselves to such a great extent that it is difficult to determine how the program serves the needs of the larger community. When the program no longer serves the larger needs of the university it can no longer draw resources from the larger university community.

SHERYL A. FRIEDLEY (GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY). Included among the Sedalia Conference recommendations was a call for research "to determine why certain individuals, women and minority group members, resist involvement." Since 1974, some preliminary demographic descriptions of debaters and tournament participants have been offered, but no concerted effort to direct research along the lines of the conference recommendations has been made; the reasons for limited female and minority group participation remain speculative in the forensic community. Moreover, no efforts have been made to identify those characteristics of women successful in forensic competition whether as participants, coaches, or program administrators.

JOHN GOSSETT (NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY). One of the expressed functions of this conference is to seek ways of unifying the various elements of the forensic community as a means of preserving and enhancing the educationally sound values of intercollegiate forensics. This quest for unity, however, must not be totally symbolic and must recognize that different elements engaged in forensics may have different perspectives as to the ways in which educationally sound values can be enhanced. Without destroying the identity or independence of any single forensic activity, we should actively promote research in existing and proposed practices in an attempt to make the entire activity stronger and more dynamic.

JACK KAY (UNIVERISTY OF NEBRASKA). Successful action to strengthen and expand forensic programs requires a three-fold approach that begins at a philosophical level. First, we must commit to a philosophy in which the forensic activity is viewed as a laboratory in which communicative and argumentative strategies are tested, practiced, studied, and evaluated. Second, we must strive to continually improve the quality of the forensic laboratory, making it more relevant to the variety of "real-world" communication and argumentation situations. Third, we must seriously promote the forensic activity, making it more visible at all levels.

THOMAS HOLLIHAN (UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA). Many of the most prestigious and important graduate programs in communication have not taken seriously their obligation to teach forensics coaches. Forensics is an important laboratory in oral advocacy, and these departments should recognize their obligation to maintain competitive programs. Forensics must continue to be a part of the academic mission of communication departments, which means that we need well-trained forensics educators who are equipped to become fully participating scholars in the discipline.

DONN W. PARSON (UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS). The major problem facing American forensics in 1984 is increased fragmentation . . . Someone once remarked that where you will find four Lutherans gathered together you will find four denominations of Lutherans. It is as if there is more strength in diversity than in unity, and the smaller the unit, the more tendency to split up. Besieged by outside forces—by inattentive administrators, inadequate budgets, unmanageable topics—the problem in American forensics is compounded by increased fragmentation and the desire to show that one's particular area of specialization is better, more important, or more substantial than other areas . . . Forensics is, indeed, a House Divided; how long it stands depends to large measure on how long it remains divided.

Chapter VI
Inter-Organizational Cooperation

A. *Forensic Cooperation: The Prospects for Harmony Through Diversity*

Jack Rhodes

The deliberations of the work group on Inter-organizational Cooperation were in a sense easier than those of most other work groups because of two factors: the unique composition of this particular group and the single agreed upon purpose of the group as implied in its title. The general harmony of purpose is perhaps symbolized by the single comprehensive resolution which this work group produced.

The composition of the work group was unique at the conference. While the other groups were initially open to all members of the forensics community and while assignment to these groups was not based on identification with a particular forensic organization, the Inter-organizational Cooperation group was composed of elected leaders of the various forensic organizations at the college level.

This difference in composition produced several important procedures and results. First, the members of the group each had a constituency to represent. They were at the Conference not only as concerned individuals but also as representatives of Pi Kappa Delta, Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha, Speech Communication Association Forensic Division, Cross Examination Debate Association, National Forensic Association, and American Forensic Association. While several belonged to multiple organizations, all were chosen because of their elected leadership positions in a specific organization

A second difference was that these people, having been elected within their respective organizations, could not only represent their constituencies but in an important sense speak for them. They could. with varying but reasonable degrees of authority, commit their organization to a course of action. This constituted a major difference between the members of this group and the members of other task forces who could recommend, explore, and debate but who could not say with reasonable assurance whether a given action might be pragmatically feasible.

A third distinction was the familarity of the group members with the assigned topic. As leaders in their organizations, the group members had been wrestling with problems of inter-organizational liaison for the past few years. Several had previously served on a similar committee (known as "The Browning Committee") of the American Forensic Association. Ed Harris, President of the NFA, had been working during the past year on a joint venture with AFA in putting together the *Intercollegiate Speech Tournament Results Booklet*. Penny Swisher, former Vice-President of CEDA, was now President of Pi Kappa Delta. There were several others who had served in offices in multiple organizations. Four of the group were also members of the Planning Committee on the National Developmental Conference itself. All had been debating and discussing the problems of cooperation for some time and had actively sought avenues of cooperation during their terms in office.

As the group convened, then, its unique composition enhanced its relatively single-minded conception of a central issue: What could best be done to foster inter-organizational cooperation among the disparate elements of the forensics community? The position papers centered on three fundamental concerns: (1) the wide variety of forensics organizations, (2) the potential merger of those organizations, and (3) the areas of mutual interest in which steps towards cooperation might be most easily and effectively be undertaken.

WIDE VARIETY OF ORGANIZATIONS

There was unanimity among the group members about the seemingly large number of forensics organizations, but there was not necessarily a concensus that the number was bad *per se*. What had been unfortunate, as Ed Harris wrote, was that "the history of the evolution of the forensics organizations has been written in terms of strife and conflict rather than cooperation."[1] A major source of concern to Penny Swisher was the neglected concept of a common educational bond among the organizations.[2] David Waite called attention to the possibility that diversity did not necessarily produce all of the problems of contemporary forensics and cautioned the work group to "concentrate only on problems caused by disunity."[3] Don Brownlee reminded the group that "the several bodies involved in this meeting . . . serve legitimate constituencies" and that each organization did, after all, have some *separate* needs as well."[4]

As the group discussed the status quo, referred to by Brownlee as "the balkanization of the forensics community,"[5] it became evident that an easy concensus was developing: while each organization had its separate and legitimate concerns, there were obvious areas of overlap, inefficiency, and duplication that needed to be addressed by the community. These areas, which were reflected in the single resolution of the group, included such items as development of a single tournament calendar, coordination of programs at the SCA convention, and development of a single national forensics directory.

POTENTIAL MERGER OF THE ORGANIZATIONS

The position papers and ensuing discussion provided a certain tone of wistfulness on this issue, a feeling that "the good old days" of a more homogenous forensics community would be comforting and cozy if only reconstructable. Another quick concensus emerged on this issue, however: such a wish remained a pragmatic impossibility. As Ed Harris phrased it is his paper, "In reality such a reorganization is virtually impossible."[6] And as Jack Rhodes noted in expanding this point, "There are too many cleavages, too many old wounds, and too many people who now hold offices or positions they would understandably be reluctant to relinquish,"[7] These same arguments led the group to conclude, with various degrees of reluctance or enthusiasm, that no currently existing organization, not even the American Forensic Association, could effectively serve as a vehicle for merger of the various associations.

AREAS OF MUTUAL COOPERATION

Consensus on the impossibility of merger or the use of an existing agency as an "umbrella" organization led the group to explore what could in fact be done to enhance cooperation among the organizations. Peg Taylor in her position paper called attention to the additional problem of the coordination of the intercollegiate and high school forensics and stated flatly that "the two-year schools have been remiss in efforts to reach out to the high schools."[8] Malcolm Sillars, chair of the group, pulled together from the position papers a list of twelve resolutions which the group might consider, almost all of which found their way into the final resolution.[9] As the group

---

All footnotes refer to position papers prepared for the Conference by members of the Work Group.

[1] Edward J. Harris, "Task Force Position Paper: Inter-organizational Cooperation," p.1.

[2] Penny Swisher, "Inter-organizational Cooperation in the Forensic Community," p.6.

[3] David Waite, "Reorganization, Cooperation, and Respect: The Prospects," p.2.

[4] Don Brownlee. "Organizational Cooperation," p.1.

[5] Don Brownlee, "Organizational Cooperation," p.1.

[6] Edward J. Harris, "Task Force Position Paper: Inter-organizational Cooperation," p.1

[7] Jack Rhodes, "Inter-organizational Cooperation," p.3.

[8] Peg Taylor, "Inter-organizational Cooperation," p.1

[9] Malcolm O. Sillars, "Initial Draft of the Report of the Work Group on Inter-organizational Cooperation," p.5.

members grappled with these concerns, consensus emerged that it was difficult but necessary to find ways to include the high schools in the scheme on inter-organizational cooperation. (When the report of the work group was amended and passed on the floor of the general assembly, the role of the high schools was strengthened further by allocating four of the fourteen seats on the new "umbrella" organization to the high school community.)

The concluding resolution of this work group soon began to take shape. The diversity of forensics organizations was not wholly undesirable, but there were areas in which cooperation would be to every organization's benefit. No single existing organization could serve as an "umbrella" and a forum for further exploration of mutual concerns, yet such a forum needed to be found. Ed Harris and Jack Rhodes then drafted a resolution calling for the creation of a new, voluntary Council of Forensic Organizations, with each separate organization sending a representative to an initial meeting in November of 1984 but with no organization surrendering any autonomy. This draft ultimately became the resolution of the work group on Inter-organizational Cooperation and was modified and passed by the entire Conference. The hope of the work group is that this new council will serve to unify the community on areas of mutual benefit and interest.

B. RESOLUTION

THAT A COUNCIL OF FORENSICS ORGANIZATIONS SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE SCA FORENSICS DIVISION. THIS COUNCIL SHALL BE COMPOSED OF TWO REPRESENTATIVES SELECTED BY EACH OF THE FOLLOWING ORGANIZATIONS: CEDA, AFA, PRP, PKD, DSR-TKA, NFA, NFL, NFHSAA, AND TWO REPRESENTATIVES OF THE HIGH SCHOOL FORENSICS COMMUNITY. NO ACTIONS OF THE COUNCIL SHALL BE BINDING ON THE INDIVIDUAL ORGANIZATIONS.

AMONG ACTIONS OF THE COUNCIL, THE FOLLOWING ARE RECOMMENDED:

1. Develop a national calendar of forensics events;
2. Develop a national forensics directory and a directory of editorial offices for publications in forensics;
3. Develop an annual results booklet;
4. Serve as a coordinating committee for national tournament dates and sites;
5. Coordinate forensics programs at the SCA convention;
6. Develop an integrated assistance program for new directors of forensics;
7. Develop a Code of Ethics applicable to all forensics organizations;
8. Serve as a forum for the discussion of problems of inter-organizational cooperation;
9. Oversee the implementation and/or coordination of relevant NDFC recommendations.

Given the plethora of forensics organizations and activities, an umbrella organization is required for the most effective coordination of the activities and professional goals of the various forensics associations. The SCA Forensics Division seems to be the most appropriate vehicle for the formation of this new organization. The Council will benefit from an initial assumption that all organizations under its umbrella are to be accorded equal status. This proposal has the advantage that it will strengthen the academic image of forensics. The Council may thus become the agency that can unite intercollegiate forensics activities with sound educational purposes and the academic study of argumentation. Each group may benefit from the coordination of its activities with those of other organizations, while no individual group need lose its autonomy.

In order to implement this resolution, the Director of the 1984 National Developmental Conference on Forensics shall notify the presidents of the member organizations that they are requested to send representatives to an initial meeting of the Council called by the SCA Forensics

Division Chair at the 1984 SCA Convention. The Chair of the Council shall be elected by the Council from within its membership. Potential sources of funding can come from assessments upon the member organizations, voluntary donations, grants, and transfers of monies from currently existing projects of the individual organizations.

Chapter VII
Topic Selection In Debate

A. *Topic Selection: Problems and Potential for Improvement*

Robert C. Rowland

One of the primary factors influencing the debate process is the topic to be debated. A particularly exciting topic on a "hot" issue much in the news may draw students into debate who would not otherwise participate.[1] At the same time, a dull topic on a highly complex technical issue may discourage students from participating in the activity. Topics also may influence particular argumentative practices. Debate on an extremely narrow resolution may encourage students to take outlandish positions as a way to create something new and different.[2] In contrast, extremely broad resolutions may cause negative debaters to develop one or two generic arguments, which they will then run round after round, regardless of applicability. In addition, inconsistency or ambiguity in topic wording may create enormous problems in a given debate. Entire debates may be spent discussing the meaning of an ambiguous word such as "any." As Carbone notes, "effective debating, it would seem, requires a clear and comprehensive understanding of the proposition in controversy."[3] The crucial point is that the debate topic acts as an important influence on the debate process. A good topic draws in new students and sets the ground for useful debate by clearly describing the policy or value change that is required. A poorly worded topic may bore students, encourage bad argumentative practices, and lead to pointless dispute over inherently ambiguous terms.

It is because of the important role played by the topic in the debate process that one work group at the National Developmental Conference on Forensics focused its attention on the problems and potential for improvement associated with topic selection.

PROBLEMS IN TOPIC SELECTION

The first major problem identified by the work group as relating to topic selection is the decline in participation in National Debate Tournament (NDT) policy debate. As Boman notes:

> There is a growing dissatisfaction with academic debate that utilizes a policy proposition. Programs which are oriented toward debating the national policy debate proposition, so-called "NDT" programs, are diminishing both in scope and size.[4]

This decline in policy debate is tied, many in the work group believe, to excessively broad topics.

The most obvious characteristic of some recent policy debate topics is extreme breadth. A resolution calling for regulation of land use literally and figuratively covers a lot of ground. National debate topics have not always been so broad. Before the late 1960s the topic often specified a particular policy change.[5] The move from narrow to broad topics has had, according to some, the effect of limiting the number of students who participate in policy debate. First, the breadth of the topics has all but destroyed novice debate. Paul Gaske argues that because the stock issues of policy debate are clearly defined, it is superior to value debate as a means of introducing students to the debate process.[6] Despite this advantage of policy debate, Gaske believes that NDT debate is not the best vehicle for teaching beginners. The problem is that broad policy topics terrify novice debaters, especially those who lack high school debate experience. They are unable to cope with the breadth of the topic and experience "negophobia,"[7] the fear of debating negative. As a consequence, the educational advantages associated with teaching novices through policy debate are lost: "Yet all of these benefits fly out the window as rookies in their formative stage quickly experience humiliation at being caught without evidence or substantive awareness of the issues that confront them at a tournament."[8] The ultimate result is that fewer novices participate in NDT, thus lessening the educational value of the activity and limiting the number of debaters who eventually participate in more advanced divisions of policy debate.

---

[1] A similar argument is made in Paul C. Gaske, "The Effect of Debate Topics on Student Participation Levels," paper presented to the National Developmental Conference on Forensics, Evanston, Illinois, September 1984, p. 4. Unless otherwise noted, all future reference will be to papers presented at the National Developmental Conference.

[2] See the position of Kevin T. Baaske, "The Educational Value of Broad Debate Topics," p. 3.

[3] Ralph Carbone, "Task Force on Selection of Debate Topics," p. 1.

[4] David L. Boman, "An Argument for Narrower Policy Debate Resolutions," p. 1.

[5] See Boman, pp. 2-3.

In addition to noting the effect on novices, participants argued that broad topics also discourage experienced debaters from continued participation in policy debate. Here, the claim is that it takes so much time and effort to be competitive on a broad topic that students who are concerned with doing more than just debate are forced out of the activity.[9] Gaske notes, that "broad topics discourage participation because of insufficient time to do requisite research."[10] The final effect may be that entire programs either cease functioning or shift to value debate as a way to avoid unreasonable research burdens. Boman supports this point: "It is this expanding necessity of evidence, and thereby research, which has created a competitive imbalance between institutions that participate in academic debate."[11] In this view, it is the competitive imbalance resulting from the use of broad topics that has led some small schools to cancel their programs.

Although the study conducted by Thomas and the work group discussions revealed a general consensus that excessively broad topics harm debate[12] and should be avoided, there was some disagreement about what it meant for a topic to be excessively broad. Several members of the group argued that very narrow topics also had unfortunate educational effects. Miller argued that extremely limited topics such as propositions calling for the adoption of a particular piece of legislation would quickly become boring and would stifle creativity. In his view, "limited topics require little thought or creativity."[13] Baaske supported this position by arguing that narrow topics might increase the incentive for debaters to develop "squirrel" cases.[14] In summary, there was general agreement about the negative effects of topics that are either too broad or too narrow.

The second major problem which the work group confronted was the conflict between Cross Examination Debate Association (CEDA) value debate and NDT policy debate.[15] It is unfortunate that some coaches in each organization attack the other form of debate as lacking merit. This conflict not only wastes time that could be spent teaching students, but also gives comfort to the enemies of debate. In addition, the conflict has the unfortunate effect of limiting the forms of debate that are available to our students. A student who could best be served by NDT or CEDA might be denied this educational opportunity because the program at his or her school did not offer that alternative. Several members of the work group argued that the educational value of the debate activity could be increased if more programs offered both NDT and CEDA debate. Baaske described the benefits which debaters at USC receive from the option of participating in both NDT and CEDA. Both Hollatz and Baaske argued that policy debate was the best vehicle for teaching novices the mechanics of the debate process. After this training in policy debate, the novices could better adapt to the unique needs of value debate. In summary, there was general agreement that a means of bridging the gap between CEDA and the NDT is needed and that topic selection procedures might be one area where such cooperation could be encouraged.

---

[6] Gaske, p. 3. Edwin A. Hollatz defended a similar view in work group discussion.

[7] Gaske, p. 3.

[8] Gaske, p. 3.

[9] Boman, p. 3.

[10] Gaske, p. 2.

[11] Boman, p. 3.

[12] Most of the participants sampled favored the selection of narrower topics. See David A. Thomas, "Results of the Delphi Study," p. 5.

[13] David Lee Miller, "In Defense of Broad Topics," p. 1.

[14] Baaske, p. 2.

[15] The dimensions of this problem are developed in Robert C. Rowland, "The Need for Rapproachement Between NDT and CEDA Debate," *Journal of the American Forensic Association,* in press.

The final problem considered by the work group can best be labelled as "bad" topics. There was a general feeling that the topic selection process had broken down in several cases, resulting in the selection of poorly worded topics. For instance, Carbone argued that in a number of instances ambiguous phrasing of debate topics has created situations in which debaters quibble over semantics rather than consider the critical value or policy question at issue.[16] For example, on the military intervention topic, many debaters focused almost entirely on the meaning of the word "any" and totally ignored all of the substantive issues involved in the topic. Surely, that result must be considered an unfortunate consequence of topic wording.

In addition, it was argued that use of encompassing words such as "all" had discouraged negative debaters from doing specific case analysis. These debaters reasoned that they need not oppose the specific affirmative plan, but only show that the plan should not be implemented in all cases. They might admit that 99.5% of hazardous wastes producers should be held legally responsible for all injuries resulting from the disposal of hazardous wastes, but deny that those who dumped waste on Indian reservations should be held responsible. The negative would then cite this Indian land exception to deny the resolution as a whole. The result would be a diminution of clash. The discussion in the work group and the results of Thomas's survey suggest that such all-encompassing wordings should be avoided to prevent the negative from ignoring the substance of the resolution by focusing on only trivial exceptions to a general policy or value.[17]

A third topic wording problem relates to the parameters. There was general agreement in the work group that the parameters have not achieved their purpose of precisely defining the meaning of the topic. The problem here is that language is inherently ambiguous.[18] When the topic committee attempts to define the meaning of one sentence with another sentence or set of sentences, there is no guarantee that the meaning of the first sentence will be clarified. Moreover, there is always the danger that the topic and parameter will be phrased in slightly different ways, thus opening up more points of dispute. The obvious conclusion drawn in the work group was that the parameter either needed to be strengthened[19] or eliminated.

The final problem with topic wording which was considered concerned the process of selecting topics. On this point, participants argued that the job of topic selection is extremely difficult because of the ends to which debaters will go to stretch topics for competitive advantage. As Miller noted: "No matter how hard the committee tries to be precise in the wording, those who want to be devious will find a way."[20] While the problem of topic selection is admittedly difficult, members felt that the absence of rigorous procedures for testing possible topics in the past had worsened the problem.[21]

---

[16] Carbone, p. 2. Also see Thomas. p. 4.

[17] There was general agreement on this point. See Thomas, p. 4.

[18] See Robert C. Rowland, "Topic Selection," p. 3.

[19] Ralph Carbone initially argued for making the parameters binding. See Carbone, p. 4. In the work group meetings he advocated other means of eliminating the ambiguity problem.

[20] Miller, p. 1.

The four resolutions on topic selection passed by the National Developmental Conference on Forensics have the potential to minimize all three of the topic wording problems identified at the conference. They also have the potential to break down entry barriers into policy debate, to encourage cooperation between NDT and CEDA, and to improve the process by which we select debate topics.

B. RESOLUTIONS

35. THE NATIONAL DEVELOPMENTAL CONFERENCE ON FORENSICS RECOMMENDS THAT EFFORTS BE TAKEN TO COORDINATE THE SELECTION OF THE TOPICS USED BY THE CROSS EXAMINATION DEBATE ASSOCIATION (CEDA) AND THE NATIONAL DEBATE TOURNAMENT (NDT).

Establishing a committee to choose problem areas for use by both CEDA and NDT has the potential to improve forensics. It would give members of the forensics community more influence over the area of dispute to be debated. Currently, a director may like a topic area but not the particular wording of a resolution. This problem can be avoided by letting directors vote on the best problem area before considering specific topics.

The proposal would increase the educational value of debate. It could help by diminishing the conflict between NDT and CEDA. Because both NDT and CEDA directors would participate in the selection process, closer relations between the two organizations could be established. In addition, if both shared the same topic area, it would be easier for directors to offer both CEDA and NDT debate. Debaters could more easily move back and forth between the two forms of debate, thus improving squad comraderie and better enabling debaters to get the most out of debate. At the same time, the proposed procedure would not encroach on the rights of either CEDA or NDT, which would retain primary control of their own topic selection procedures.

Specific recommendations for implementation were included in this resolution. The SCA Forensics Division should establish a topic-problem area selection committee, composed of the chairperson of the CEDA topic committee, a representative from the CEDA executive council, the chairperson of the CIDD, a representative from the NDT committee, and an elder statesperson not actively coaching who will act as chairperson and be appointed by the SCA Forensics Division.

The topic-problem area selection committee should meet at the SCA convention to choose five problem areas. Problem areas considered should be broad areas of dispute about values and policies such as the problem of technology in a modern society. The committee shall then send out a preliminary ballot to all members of the forensics community to select two problems for consideration for the following year. The two problem areas receiving the most votes will be announced on January 15.

The topic committee shall then select three to five specific topics in each problem area. In late spring the committee shall send out a final ballot for selecting the problem area to be debated by both CEDA and NDT. All members of the forensics community shall vote on the choice between the two problem areas. Specific topics for NDT use shall be included on the ballot. Schools participating in the CIDD selection process shall rank the topics within each problem area. The problem area selected shall be announced on August 1. The specific NDT topic receiving the most votes, within the area selected by the forensics community as a whole, shall be the NDT topic for that year and shall be announced on September 10.

---

[21] Thomas found great support for having seminars at tournaments in the second semester to test topic wordings. See Thomas, p. 4.

The CEDA topic committee may choose to include their specific topics on the problem area mailing or may send out a final ballot following announcement of the problem area. Only members of CEDA vote on their specific topics. The specific CEDA topic receiving the most votes within the general problem area selected by the forensics community as a whole shall be the CEDA topic for the fall semester and shall be announced on September 10.

36. THE NATIONAL DEVELOPMENTAL CONFERENCE ON FORENSICS RECOMMENDS THAT THE TOPIC SELECTION COMMITTEES COMPOSE RESOLUTIONS FOR DEBATE CONSISTING OF NARROWER, MORE SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF THE NATIONAL RESOLUTION FOR SUGGESTED USE BY TOURNAMENT DIRECTORS IN NOVICE DIVISIONS.

The present operation of tournaments using a common resolution in all divisions constitutes a significant entry barrier to novice and beginning debaters. This recommendation would enable more novice and beginning debaters to enter competition at an earlier date; it would improve the quality of argumentation in novice debates; it would focus teaching in research and analysis, especially on the negative; and it would encourage more novice divisions in tournaments, thus promoting junior division and varsity level competition.

37. THE NATIONAL DEVELOPMENTAL CONFERENCE ON FORENSICS RECOMMENDS THAT THE SPONSORING ORGANIZATIONS OF THE CIDD SHOULD ELIMINATE THE PARAMETERS FROM DEBATE RESOLUTIONS.

The addition of parameters to the topic selection process has proven counter-productive. As all language is inherently subjective, the addition of the parameter necessarily increases the ambiguity of topic analysis. This problem has been compounded by poorly or inconsistently worded parameters, and has led judges to apply parameters inconsistently. The problem could be corrected by eliminating the parameters.

THE NATIONAL DEVELOPMENTAL CONFERENCE ON FORENSICS RECOMMENDS THAT THE TOPIC SELECTION COMMITTEES SEEK TO REDUCE, AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE, THE AMBIGUITY OF TERMS USED IN DEBATE RESOLUTIONS, INCLUDING:

A. USE CAUTION WHEN EMPLOYING ENCOMPASSING TERMS SUCH AS "ALL," "EVERY," OR "ANY";
B. USE CAUTION WHEN EMPLOYING VAGUE OR COMPOUNDING WORDS OR PHRASES SUCH AS "GREATER" OR "ANY AND ALL";
C. CONSULT WITH EXPERTS IN FIELDS RELATIVE TO THE RESOLUTION ON THE PHRASING AND INTERPRETATION OF ACTUAL DEBATE TOPICS;
D. SPECIFY CLEARLY THE NATURE AND DIRECTION OF CHANGE OR DECISION;
E. PROMOTE, SPONSOR, AND CONDUCT REGIONAL SEMINARS AT FALL AND SPRING TOURNAMENTS AND CONFERENCES TO EXPLORE, DISCUSS, AND EVEN PLAY-TEST TOPIC INTERPRETATIONS IN ORDER TO GENERATE INPUT FOR FUTURE TOPIC SELECTION;
F. SEEK WORDING WHICH WOULD BALANCE THE NEED FOR MAINTAINING INTEREST OVER TIME WITH THE NEED TO LIMIT THE TOPIC TO CREATE A MEANINGFUL LEVEL OF RESEARCH AND DISCUSSION.

The value of the debate experience depends in large part on the topic to be debated. Excessively broad, ambiguously worded, or overly restrictive topics can limit the educational value of debate. Extremely broad topics create research burdens which discourage participation in debate. They also may give the affirmative team an unfair advantage. Ambiguous topic wording may shift the debate from the substance of fact, value, or policy issues of the resolution to linguistic or technical questions of lesser educational importance. Overly restrictive topics may not adequately challenge debaters for an entire season. The guidelines included in this recommendation have the potential for improving the topic selection process as well as improving the wording of specific debate topics.

C. STATEMENTS FROM POSITION PAPERS

KEVIN BAASKE (UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA). Those who target broad topics as the culprit misplace the blame. The cause of the frustration experienced by debaters and coaches alike stems from the divergent theoretical perspectives employed by judges, not from the intrinsic qualities of broad topics.

DAVID MILLER (LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY). My primary suggestion is to have multiple topics, much like the practice of CEDA. Massive evidence files are of no practical value if there is more evidence than debaters can become familiar with in a given period of time. It is more likely that squads will do preliminary research after each topic is announced, to become acquainted with the issues, followed by a more organized research effort across broader lines.

EDWIN A. HOLLATZ (WHEATON COLLEGE). What has contributed to the demise of rational discourse in intercollegiate debate? Some would hold that the nature and wording of the topic is an important factor. There may be some validity to this, especially the choice of topics that call for very detailed plans. . . . . Beyond the role of the nature and wording of the debate resolution, it is my contention that there is a more significant area of concern: the demise of rational discourse is the ultimate responsibility of the coach/judge.

PAUL C. GASKE (SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY). When potential access to resources is a pivotal concern in competitive success, as it is with broad topics, many schools opt not to participate and instead seek more limited research alternatives. . . Broad topics discourage participation because of insufficient time to do requisite research. . . . A third reason why broad topics restrict participation levels is what can be termed "negophobia"—novice debaters' fear of debating the negative.

RALPH E. CARBONE (BUTLER UNIVERSITY). In order for the debate experience to work, however, it is essential that the debaters have the opportunity to use these skills to their utmost. Such "effective" debating, it would seem, requires a clear and comprehensive understanding of the proposition in controversy. . . Recommendations for the reduction of errors in the process of phrasing the resolution should include: (1) a recognition of the problems of semantic and syntactic ambiguity, and (2) a better consideration of relative and technical terminology.

DAVID BOMAN (WASHBURN UNIVERSITY). The impacts of broad topics, which result in a tremendous research burden on debaters, have had a profound effect on academic debate. . . . It is this expanding necessity of evidence, and thereby research, which has created a competitive imbalance between institutions that participate in academic debate. . . . Focusing on the selection of debate topics and the wording of these resolutions is a reasonable first step in the revitalization of NDT debate.

PAT GANER (CYPRESS COLLEGE). One of the major problems facing novice debaters is the sheer breadth of topics. When novices encounter a plethora of cases at the same time they are encountering a plethora of technical debate concepts, they are not sure they can master both areas, and many drop out. Having a more restricted topic for novice debaters would solve much of the problem. After the novices have gained a depth of understanding on one aspect of the topic, they are ready to move to the broader topic. Since the activity is ultimately dependent, both philosophically and pragmatically, on the participation of numbers of committed students, a special more limited topic for novices should enhance the activity.

Chapter VIII
Summer Institutes

A. *Enhancing Summer Educational Opportunities*

V. William Balthrop

INTRODUCTION

The initial charge presented to the Work Group on Summer Institutes was to address the concerns expressed by many high school forensic sponsors

> about the kind of instruction and debate theory which their students are learning at summer institutes. They are also concerned about the kind of social-personal-moral standards which are revealed at some institutes. This group is asked to examine not only high school debate institutes but also to address itself to the broader question of the desirability of summer institutes in debate or IE at both the high school and college levels.

From this beginning, Work Group members circulated position papers assessing perceived areas of concern as well as strengths, and provided recommendations for enhancing the educational opportunities provided by institutes. Finally, after extensive discussions within the Work Group, characterized by a frank exchange among participants and ultimate agreement on all substantive issues, a series of recommendations was presented to the Conference's Parliamentary Assembly.

During these discussions, participants gained a clearer perspective on summer institutes and recognized in greater clarity the complexities and conflicts that Richardson identified between "Coaches, parents, students, institute directors, institute staff, and the hosting institutions," and the disagreements that may emerge "as to the goals, methods, environment, and assumptions involved in the institute undertaking." Examples of such conflicts are those between attempts to provide financial aid and to hire more professional staff with the goal of keeping institute costs low. Further, virtually every pedagogical practice criticized in one context could be defended as pedagogically sound in another. "Group cases," for instance, might be undesirable for intermediate and advanced students, yet extremely valuable for teaching novices. Handbooks, too, while faulted when producing overreliance and reducing original research efforts, may provide valuable supplemental material to students in forming a base from which their own analysis and research might proceed. This seems particularly true for institutes of shorter durations.

A final point emerging during these sessions was the recognition that teaching forensics is unique in many respects. Cutbirth described forensic education as imitation, practice, critique, and more practice—a process he identified as "guided absorption."

As a result of these discussions, Work Group members were reluctant to recommend specific criteria or "do's and don'ts." Equally unacceptable was any form of licensing, sanctioning or enforcement. This conclusion resulted from a combination of philosophical objections to prescribing or excluding any specific pedagogical practice, along with the very pragmatic consideration that no organization apparently has, wishes to apply or even seeks authority to enforce standards. Nevertheless, the Work Group believed it important to take strong positions in encouraging positive approaches to enhance the educational opportunities provided students and teachers through summer institutes.

It should be noted that the focus of this Group was the high school debate institute, both in the position papers and in subsequent discussions at the Conference. Nevertheless, the concerns addressed were of such a nature that they apply to individual events institutes as well as debate, and to institutes designed for collegiate as well as high school students.

DESIRABILITY OF SUMMER INSTITUTES

Participants in the Group were faced with the paradox outlined by Hingstman that, "If any institution in forensics may be a victim of its own success, it is the summer. . . institute." Although a lack of research makes accurate data unavailable, estimates for the summer of 1984 indicate that more than 2,000 high school students attended more than fifty sessions located at universities, colleges and other locations. The importance of institutes goes beyond the numbers attending, however, ultimately resting in the perceived influence of workshops upon forensic activities throughout the following year.

During the course of discussion, a consensus developed that high school coaches do have legitimate concerns about many practices at summer institutes. At the same time, coaches appear to recognize the potential for considerable benefits to themselves and to their students. As Louden and Chandler commented, "The paradox is that the summer institute is for many coaches a 'scapegoat' *AND* the place where the same coaches send their students." Among the contributions of institutes identified by this Group were the following: (1) a focused period of intense forensic preparation, benefitting academic performance and squad preparation in the context of an increasingly crowded school year; (2) additional opportunities for learning and applying argumentation and communication theories; (3) providing the student with motivation to excel; (4) broadening the students' horizons toward learning; and (5) opportunity for interaction between high school and college students and faculty.

This concensus on the worth of institutes rested not only upon the individual experiences of group members, but received corroboration from research presented from two separate sources. Louden and Chandler presented data from their position paper that students attending institutes see themselves as receiving many of these same benefits. Further, a more extensive research effort, presented in session to the Work Group by Ed Hinck and Ken Johnson from the University of Kansas, indicated that, on balance, high school forensic sponsors also find institutes beneficial. Their research study is presented in this chapter.

Such benefits, however, do not necessarily appear in every summer institute, but seem most prevalent when *educationally sound principles and practices* are followed. Although the Work Group composed neither an exhaustive nor overly specific description of what principles and practices might be "educationally sound," some guidelines were proposed: (1) The instructional program should include a reasonable balance between theory and the pragmatics of competition. (2) The director should ensure that students receive a coordinated and cohesive program of instruction. (3) Students should be supervised effectively in work habits, scholarly standards, competitive practices, and social behavior. (4) Directors should maintain an atmosphere that emphasizes a cooperative learning environment. (5) Institutes should consider the problem of financial accessibility. (6) Channels for communication between workshop personnel and high school sponsors/parents should be developed and used appropriately. And (7) Institutes should be subject to review by institutional internal processes.

In light of these considerations, the Work Group reaffirmed the 1974 Sedalia Conference's commitment to institutes following such standards.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT

The greatest concentration of criticism toward summer institutes fell within the broad categories of scholarship, pedagogical practice, and administration. In one form or another, almost all objections addressed the responsibility of institute directors to assure that staff members were well-trained and supervised in instructional philosophy and technique, committed to the highest standards of scholarship, and aware of professional standards for conduct.

SCHOLARSHIP

Somewhat discouragingly, the most frequent and severe indictments of institutes focused upon standards of scholarship. As McClain commented, the

> conclusions of prepared blocks of arguments either go well beyond the evidence or do not follow from the evidence presented. Several perfectly accurate quotations from a variety of different contexts over a significant period of years are strung together as if there were enough contextual agreement to justify the conclusion. For some reason these arguments are frequently accepted in debates but would be rejected by all of us in the context of an assigned research paper.

Other comments echoed Frana's when he lamented "overreliance on handbooks. . ., research quotas leading to sloppiness, inaccuracy, and context difficulties. . . and lack of documentation." Criticisms were also directed against a perceived emphasis on individual cases and lines of argument rather than upon an understanding of the resolution in its broader sense.

PEDADOGY

The most broadly based criticism addressed instructional emphasis on pragmatic attention to the current topic and strategic considerations at the expense of theory (debate, argumentation and communication) and analytical skills. This general indictment was extended to individual events as well, in that emphasis is frequently upon the selection, cutting and performance of literature or original speech topics for effect rather than an understanding of broader issues of criticism, literary appreciation, or persuasion. While it was accepted by all Work Group members that it is pedagogically sound to incorporate exemplary material from the current topic into sessions on theory or analysis, the call seemed clear— particularly from high school coaches—for a better balance.

The second most common set of indictments concentrated upon the composition of staff. Faced with pressures to reduce costs, many institutes opt for the solution noted by Louden and Chandler: "All too often staff selection is based on convenience and costs, resulting in disproportionate representation of undergraduates with little or no teaching skills." Others called for greater supervision of in-class instruction and development of teaching skills. Among the most frequently mentioned remedies was the pairing of more experienced teachers, particularly high school forensic sponsors, with those less skilled.

A number of other individual teaching practices used by many institutes were also criticized. Among these were the use of "squad cases", inordinate emphasis on the amount of evidence and arguments presented in the debate, on the importance of speed in delivery, on such strategic practices as "time-wasters", and on institute tournaments.

ADMINISTRATION

Perhaps the most potentially damaging criticism is that institutes occasionally provide inadequate supervision of students attending. Admittedly, most participants took pains to note that such incidents were the exception rather than the rule, but that unfortunate occurrences did occur. It was noted that, while college educators function in an environment of relative permissiveness with little responsibility for the personal lifestyles of their students, such is not the case for their secondary school colleagues. As Frana commented, "*In loco parentis* may be passé on a college or university campus; it is a fact of life in the American high school. Abuses and illegal activities have occurred."

Accordingly, the Work Group concluded that institute directors must take stronger efforts to minimize such problems. Institute directors should create opportunities for sharing insights and techniques with one another. Possible options for such exchanges might be SCA Short Courses or Action Caucuses, professional publications, and programs and panels at national and regional conventions.

DISSEMINATION OF INSTITUTE INFORMATION

One of the most important elements in providing an optimal educational opportunity is "matching" each student with the institute most appropriate for his or her individual skills and needs. High school forensic sponsors, students and parents have the responsibility of selecting from among many options the particular institute—if any—that a student should attend. The exercise of an informed decision-making process is diminished, however, by the shortage of comparable information and lack of awareness about alternatives available. Louden and Chandler, for instance, reported that, in their sample, students attending institutes were "familiar with only an average of 11.1 workshops. . . . More importantly, the average students considered only 3.04 workshops when making their decision to attend a workshop."

Equally critical to the decision-making process, however, is the fact that information typically available to students and sponsors is either promotional literature distributed by the institutes themselves or the rudimentary outline of dates, projected enrollments, costs and type of events offered that is contained in the SCA's listing of summer institutes and in some forensic periodicals. Hingstman pointed out the difficulties with promotional material: "Institute administrators. . . should be more candid about what their workshops can and cannot accomplish educationally. Forensics sponsors justly can be annoyed when a workshop brochure promises student participation and delivers an package that is heavily weighted in favor of one kind of benefit at the expense of the other." Richardson described the current SCA listing as a "very sketchy beginning" and argued that "Students need much more information before selecting an institute."

If institute directors provided more thorough, more accurate descriptions and provided information in one source that allowed comparisons among institutes, a better informed selection could be made that should reduce misunderstandings and potential conflicts, resulting in closer matching of student needs to workshop experiences.

ENHANCING FORENSIC EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

A concern expressed by many participants was the increasing cost of attending institutes, particularly "prestigious national" institutes, and the corresponding implications for forensic activities. Recruiting and administrative procedures of summer institutes may contribute to latent discrimination based upon socio-economic, racial, cultural, geographic and other factors. Forensics is historically and philosophically committed to educational opportunity, implicit in which is equal access. By neglecting efforts at equal access, summer institutes may unwittingly promote an objectionable form of elitism among participants. Some argued that such consequences may already be upon us. Richardson, for example, argued that, "It is probable that summer forensic institutes cater to America's upper middle and upper class. . . thus leaving poorer students with the impression that they are less welcome in American forensic programs." Frana presented the implications quite strongly: "Connections now overcome diligence; reputation prevails over intelligent, thoughtful work; money supercedes talent. Workshops, then, lead to a caste system in high school forensics." Work group members were concerned to find ways to reduce or eliminate this problem.

Expansion of educational opportunities might be found in several areas: (1) alternative structures, including commuter and one-day or weekend workshops sponsored by high schools, forensic leagues, associations, and universities; (2) balancing economic requirements with educational goals to make summer institutes more affordable to students; (3) pursuit of alternative forms of financing such as grants, independent sources for student scholarships, and tuition waivers; and (4) seeking strategies for contacting and attracting minority and economically disadvantaged students, i.e., cooperation with Affirmative Action officers and agencies.

INSTITUTE—HIGH SCHOOL RELATIONS

This area of criticism centered upon the realization that too little communication of any substantive nature exists between high school forensic sponsors and the directors of institutes. While summer institutes have provided benefits to forensic education, diffusion of those benefits throughout the forensic community has been slowed by limited opportunities for discussion of forensic theory and practice by *all* members of the community. The previous recommendation on dissemination of information addresses part of this concern.

More importantly, however, are other benefits that can strengthen practices at all levels of instruction with such interactions. Including high school sponsors on institute staffs would assist in modifying instructional practices at workshops to meet more completely the educational needs of students. Appropriate comments from high school directors can facilitate the learning experience by providing information on how to handle and motivate the student, about the coach's experiences with the student, and about expectations and goals for that student.

Concerns with communication do not extend in one direction, however. The benefits of such efforts can contribute considerably to maintaining a strong educational environment throughout the year. By working at summer institutes as staff members or by attending a teachers' workshop run concurrently, high school sponsors may take advantage of increased opportunities to acquire or refresh knowledge of forensic theory and practice. As directors provide post-institute reports on the student's accomplishments and recommendations for follow-up work, the sponsor will be made to feel a more integral part of the student's skill development. Through these and such other possibilities as seminars and clinics during the school year, greater contact between forensic educators will increase the quality of instruction in secondary schools.

RESEARCH ON INSTITUTES AND FORENSIC PRACTICES

In preparing for this Conference, members of this Work Group lamented the lack of research addressing summer institutes. While relatively recent studies by Matlon and Shoen, Monsma and Sayer, Pruett, Sayer, Shoen and Matlon, and Welch are cited,[1] additional research is needed. Louden and Chandler took steps in this direction with the material presented in their position paper; and Hinck and Johnson provided detailed data on high school coaches' perceptions of institutes in their research project.

Further, forensics often perpetuates traditional practices with little awareness of alternatives and their potential benefits in meeting pedagogical goals. Summer institutes, partly in response to market pressures for established structures and partly from inertia, appear reluctant to experiment with innovations in instructional practice and format. Yet few other aspects of forensic activity provide the opportunities for experimentation since summer institutes are not rigidly governed by rules like many state and national associations and tournaments.

---

[1] See Ronald J. Matlon and Richard J. Schoen, "Administration of Summer High School Debate Workshops: A National Poll," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 10 (1974), 217-228; John W. Monsma and James E. Sayer, "Report of Action Caucus on High School Workshops," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 10 (1973), 111-115; Robert Pruett, "The Student's Perception of the Effects of a Summer High School Debate Institute," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 9 (1972, 279-281; James Edward Sayer, "Multi-phase v. Single-phase Institutes: A Rebuttal," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 11 (1975), 220-222; and "The Summer Debate/Forensic Workshop," *Debate Issues*, 12 (1979), 1 and 14 (1984), 4; Richard L. Shoen and Ronald J. Matlon, "A Survey of Content and Teaching Methods in High School Summer Debate Workshops," *Speech Teacher*, 23 (1974), 40-50; and Mary Welch, "High School Debate Workshop: Coaches React," *Debate Issues*, 17 (1984), 4.

CONCLUSION

The Work Group on Summer Institutes presented the following recommendations with the assumption that primary responsibility for their implementation would rest with institute directors and various professional organizations. All members to some extent shared Cutbirth's somewhat pointed observation that, "summer institutes operate in a buyer's market. There are so many institutes from which to choose that if a workshop habitually ignores standards of decency and common sense (to say nothing of legality), it can easily be shunned. . . Coaches thus wield enormous power over the attendance at any particular institute." By implication, then, primary responsibility for inadequacies in summer institutes could be attributed to the high school coaches who enroll their students.

Nevertheless, the responsibility for providing the strongest possible educational environment at summer institutes is a joint one, and the recommendations forwarded from this Work Group are efforts to promote assumption of that responsibility by institute and high school directors. The Group's underlying premise was outlined by Frana in his position paper: "Colleges and universities can and should take the initiative in implementing suggested reforms. . . in summer forensic institutes. At the same time high school forensic directors should become concerned and involved to a greater extent with the institutes. They should be consulted, and they should offer support for reforms." These recommendations represent a beginning toward improving forensic education at summer institutes.

B. RESOLUTIONS

39. THE NATIONAL DEVELOPMENTAL CONFERENCE ON FORENSICS RECOGNIZES THE CONTRIBUTIONS MADE TO FORENSIC EDUCATION BY SUMMER INSTITUTES FOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS AND ENCOURAGES THE CONTINUATION OF SUCH INSTITUTES BASED ON EDUCATIONALLY SOUND PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES.

The 1974 National Developmental Conference on Forensics expressed a commitment to encourage summer institutes predicated upon "educationally sound principles and practices." This recommendation acknowledges the benefits of such institutes, benefits widely recognized by students and high school and collegiate educators.

The contributions of institutes include: (1) a focused period of intense forensic preparation, benefitting academic performance and squad preparation in the context of an increasingly crowded school year; (2) additional opportunities for learning and applying argumentation and communication theories; (3) providing the student with motivation to excel; (4) broadening the student's horizons toward learning, (5) opportunity for interaction between high school and college students and faculty.

"Educationally sound principles and practices" should include such criteria as the following: (1) The instructional program should include a reasonable balance between theory and the pragmatics of competition. (2) The director should ensure that students receive a coordinated and cohesive program of instruction. (3) Students should be effectively supervised in work habits, scholarly standards, competitive practices, and social behavior. (4) Directors should maintain an atmosphere that emphasizes a cooperative learning environment. (6) Institutes should consider the problem of financial accessibility. (7) Channels for communication between workshop personnel and high school sponsors/parents should be developed and used appropriately. (8) Institutes should be subject to review by institutional internal processes.

40. ALL HIGH SCHOOL INSTITUTE DIRECTORS SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY STAFF DEVELOPMENT IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS:

1. INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

   INSTITUTE STAFF SHOULD BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR HIGH STANDARDS OF SCHOLARSHIP. ALL EVIDENCE GENERATED AT THE INSTITUTE SHOULD BE ACCURATE WITH PROPER SOURCE CITATION, AND STUDENTS SHOULD BE FAMILIAR WITH THE CONTEXT IN WHICH IT APPEARED. STAFF SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE SOUNDNESS OF ARGUMENTS (I.E., THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EVIDENCE AND CLAIMS) IN AFFIRMATIVE CASES AND IN BRIEFS, IN ORIGINAL SPEAKING EVENTS AND IN CUTTINGS OF LITERATURE. INSTITUTE STAFFS SHOULD PROMOTE STUDENT AWARENESS AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE ETHICS OF PUBLIC ADVOCACY.

2. SUPERVISION

   THE INSTITUTE STAFF SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE HEALTH, SAFETY AND GENERAL WELL-BEING OF ALL STUDENTS. CODES OF ACCEPTABLE CONDUCT SHOULD BE CLEARLY DEVELOPED, ARTICULATED AND ENFORCED.

3. STAFF-STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS

   THE STAFF SHOULD MAINTAIN A PROFESSIONAL RELATIONSHIP WITH STUDENTS AT ALL TIMES.

Institutes have an obligation to provide an atmosphere conducive to learning and skill acquisition. Such an atmosphere requires effective supervision of students at all times and adherence by staff to the highest professional standards. Institute directors should assure that standards of personal behavior for students and staff are clearly articulated and enforced. Institute staffs should be aware of the need to present positive role-models to students.

One of the unique characteristics of many summer institutes is the reliance on college students who have little or no experience in a teaching role. Their success as debaters and individual speakers and performers does not guarantee equal success in teaching. Clear expectations of their role and conduct will help alleviate some recurring problems, and pairing inexperienced staff members with experienced teachers and careful monitoring of new staff members is recommended.

The educational value of forensic activities should take precedence over short-cuts to prepare students for an institute tournament or other competitive events. Students should know how to conduct original research and to cut literature, should understand the limitations of handbook evidence, should be taught the importance of accurately recording evidence and the importance of proper source citations, and should understand the necessity of being true to source context and assumptions. Students should be taught that the conclusion of an argument is only as strong as the evidence upon which it is based and should accept personal responsibility for their public utterances.

41. THE SPEECH COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION SHOULD EXPAND ITS EXISTING GATHERING AND DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION ABOUT HIGH SCHOOL INSTITUTES. MATERIAL SHOULD BE INCLUDED SUCH AS (1) A STATEMENT OF PHILOSOPHICAL ORIENTATION; (2) DESCRIPTIONS OF CURRICULAR STRUCTURE, STAFFING GOALS AND DEVELOPMENT, AND STUDENT AND STAFF SUPERVISION; (3) FULL DISCLOSURE OF ALL ANTICIPATED COSTS SUCH AS TUITION, SUPPLEMENTAL FEES AND EXPENSES, AND SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS; AND (4) IDENTIFICATION OF STUDENT POPULATIONS WHOSE INTERESTS ARE BEST SERVED BY THAT INSTITUTE'S PARTICULAR FORMAT.

High school forensic directors, students and parents have the responsibility of selecting from many options the particular institute — if any — that a student should attend. The exercise of informed decision-making process is diminished, however, by the shortage of comparable information and lack of awareness of alternatives available. The information typically available is either promotional literature distributed by the institutes themselves or the rudimentary outline of dates, projected enrollments, costs and type of events offered contained in the SCA's Listing of Summer Institutes and some forensic periodicals.

By soliciting from institute directors more thorough descriptions and by addressing a number of common factors and practices across workshops, the SCA can promote a better informed selection that should reduce misunderstandings, potential conflicts, and improve matching of student needs to workshop experiences. Research indicates that sponsors are frequently unaware of the diversity of institutes currently available; widespread distribution would thus serve the interests of both institutes and students.

42. THE NATIONAL DEVELOPMENTAL CONFERENCE ON FORENSICS ENDORSES AFFIRMATIVE ACTIONS TO INCREASE DIVERSITY OF THE STUDENT POPULATION ATTENDING SUMMER INSTITUTES.

Recruiting and administrative procedures of summer institutes may contribute to latent discrimination based upon socio-economic, racial, cultural, geographic or other factors. Forensics is historically and philosophically committed to educational opportunity, implicit in which is equal access. By neglecting efforts at equal access, summer institutes unwittingly may promote an objectionable form of elitism among participants.

Directors of summer institutes and the high school directors who encourage student attendance should examine their assumptions in planning summer activities and creatively provide educational opportunities to all interested students. Expansion of educational opportunities may be found in several areas. (1) Alternative structures, including commuter and one-day or weekend workshops. Such efforts might be sponsored by high schools, forensic leagues, associations as well as universities. (2) Balancing economic requirements with educational goals in order to make summer institutes more affordable to students. (3) Pursuit of alternative forms of financing such as grants, independent sources for student scholarships, and tuition waivers, (4) Seeking out strategies for contacting and attracting minority and economically disadvantaged students in close cooperation with Affirmative Action officers and agencies.

43. THE NATIONAL DEVELOPMENTAL CONFERENCE ON FORENSICS ENCOURAGES GREATER INTERACTION AMONG DIRECTORS OF FORENSICS IN HIGH SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES IN THE DISCUSSION OF FORENSICS THEORY AND PRACTICE.

Both high school and college forensics activities have benefitted from the instruction provided by summer institutes. The diffusion of these benefits throughout the forensics community, however, has been slowed by the limited opportunities for discussion of forensics theory and practice by *all* members of the community. Enhanced interaction among high school and college forensics directors would be valuable to both groups. It would improve the quality of forensics instruction in secondary schools and it would assist college directors in modifying instructional practices in summer workshops to meet more completely the educational needs of participants.

Greater efforts should be made to open regular lines of communication. First, summer institute directors should take positive [illegible] to include high school directors on summer institute staffs, while high school directors should take full advantage of opportunities to acquire or refresh knowledge of forensics theory and practice. Second, institute directors should increase efforts to obtain pre- and post-institute comments on curriculum and structure. Third, coaching workshops that run concurrently with summer student institutes should be made more accessible to high school forensics directors. Forensics directors could obtain valuable theoretical perspectives while participating in the application of argumentation theory to practice by assisting in the training of workshop students.

Fourth, seminars and clinics for high school teachers conducted by experienced instructors during the academic year should be expanded. Finally, small commuter-type day summer institutes should be encouraged to increase direct pedagogical cooperation among local college and high school forensics directors.

44. THE NATIONAL DEVELOPMENTAL CONFERENCE ON FORENSICS ENCOURAGES THE DEVELOPMENT OF FORENSIC INNOVATIONS IN SUMMER INSTITUTES AND SCHOLARLY RESEARCH CONCERNING INSTITUTES AND GENERAL FORENSIC PRACTICES.

The forensics activity often perpetuates traditional practices and methods at the expense of experimentation. Summer workshops, in response to market pressures and established structures, are often reluctant to innovate. Yet few other experiences in forensics education provide similar opportunities for systematic evaluation of possible changes.

Workshops also are a unique setting for productive research about institute curricula, structure, and participants, as well as about forensics activities in general. Most workshops are hosted by universities and colleges that have available staff or on-campus personnel with the expertise to conduct research. This research, while important, should not compete with sound educational objectives.

PERCEPTIONS OF HIGH SCHOOL INSTRUCTORS REGARDING PRACTICES AND EFFECTS OF HIGH SCHOOL DEBATE WORKSHOPS

Edward A. Hinck and Shelly L. Schaefer

The last twenty years in American interscholastic debate have witnessed increasing preparation on the high school topic during the summer months before school starts. One primary impetus for such preparation is the summer debate institute. As institutes have grown in number, they have been the objects of both praise and blame, largely based on individual experiences. Yet how high school instructors as a group perceive institute or workshop practices and problems has received little attention, and justification for this study lies in the fact that little is known systematically about how high school institutes affect the high school community. Previous research has assessed the degree to which perceptions of high school students and instructors agree on effectiveness of institute instruction,[1] whether or not workshops improve cognitive abilities,[2] comparisons of multi-versus single-phase curricula,[3] and surveyed content and teaching methods in institutes.[4] The purpose of this study is to determine how high school instructors perceive summer debate workshop practices.

The fact that high school instructors have been discussing institute practices in the professional literature reveals a need to understand the effects of workshops from the perspective of the instructor.[5] This study was undertaken to provide needed data on the degree to which high school instructors perceived problems to exist in high school workshops. This paper reports the research questions, method of study, results of the survey, provides recommendations for future research, and offers recommendations for the improvement of summer institute practices.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research questions grew out of two major issues: what are the perceived effects of high school workshops on students as reported by their high school instructors, and to what degree do demographic variables influence the perceptions of effects of high school debate workshops. To answer these two general inquires, the following research questions were posed:

R-1: To what extent do high school instructors perceive problems in high school debate workshops?

A. Primary concerns:

1. Logic—do workshops improve or diminish students' ability to use logic as perceived by respondents?
2. Rhetorical skills—do workshops improve or diminish students' rhetorical skills?
3. Ability to explain arguments—do workshops improve or diminish students' ability to explain arguments?

---

[1] See Ronald J. Matlon and Richard J. Schoen, "Administration of Summer High School Debate Workshops: A National Poll," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 10 (1974), 217-228.

[2] See Edward A. Hinck, Andrew J. Rist and Kenneth M. Johnson." An Empirical Investigation of the Immediate Effects of a Two Week Course on the Argumentation Skills of High School Debaters," paper presented to the Central States Speech Association, Lincoln, Nebraska, April 7-8, 1983; Richard Huseman, Glenn Wave, and Charles Gruner, "Critical Thinking, Reflective Thinking, and the Ability to Organize Ideas: A Multivariate Approach," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 9 (1972), 261-265.

[3] James Edward Sayer, "Multi-phase vs. Single-phase Institutes" "A Rebuttal," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 11, (1975), 220-222.

[4] Richard L. Schoen and Ronald J. Matlon, "A Survey of the Content and Teaching Methods in High School Summer Debate Workshops," Speech Teacher, 23 (1974), 40-50.

[5] Mary Welch, "High School Debate Workshop: Coaches React," *Debate Issues*, 17(1984),4.

    4. Ethics of advocacy—do workshops impart an appropriate or inappropriate ethics of advocacy?
    5. Morality of staff—are workshops composed of individuals with sound morals and ethics?
  B. Secondary concerns:
    1. Role of handbooks—to what extent do handbooks help students understand the topic?
    2. Staff training—to what extent are high school debate workshop staffs adequately trained for the supervision of high school students?
    3. Construction of arguments—to what extent do high school students construct their own arguments at high school workshops?

R-2: Do the following demographic variables influence perceptions of problems in high school debate workshops?
  A. Does the sample influence perceptions of problems in high school debate workshops?
  B. Does the nature of the high school program influence perceptions of problems in high school debate workshops?
    1. Does the total number of students sent to high school debate workshops influence perceptions of problems in high school debate workshops?
    2. Does the number of students sent per year influence the perceptions of problems in high school debate workshops?
  C. Does teaching experience influence perceptions of problems in high school debate workshops?
    1. Does the total number of years of teaching experience influence the perceptions of problems in high school debate workshops?
    2. Does the total number of years of debate coaching experience influence perceptions of problems in high school debate workshops?
    3. Does the total number of years of coaching individual events influence perceptions of problems in high school debate workshops?
  D. Does college debate experience influence perceptions of problems in high school debate workshops?
    1. Do respondents with no college debate experience perceive problems in high school debate workshops differently than those respondents with college debate experience?
    2. Does the number of years of college debate experience influence perceptions of problems in high school debate workshops?

To answer these questions a survey questionnaire was constructed. The construction of the questionnaire and other methodological considerations concerning the sample of the survey and procedures for data analysis are discussed in the following section on methodology.

METHOD

The survey questionnaire has three parts. The first part of the survey inquires into the perceptions of practices at high school institutes and practices which might stem from high school debate institute experiences. The second part of the questionnaire provides four open-ended questions allowing the respondent to indicate areas of concern not accounted for in the first part of the survey. The third part of the survey provides necessary demographic data for an analysis of the variables which might influence the results of the survey.

Survey items for the first part of the questionnaire were selected because of their basic nature for an adequate pedagogy of forensics. Those concerns were instruction in the use of logic, rhetorical skills, ability to explain arguments, ethics of advocacy, staff maturity and training, and the degree to which students constructed and understood their arguments. While it was assumed that these were minimal expectations for adequate instruction in argumentation, it was not assumed that these issues formulated a complete description of expectations by high school instructors. Because of the nature of survey research, time available on the part of the respondents, and the level of interest on the part of the respondents, it was necessary to limit survey items to the fewest number of questions possible. An excessive number of survey items might have risked an even lower return rate than that reported in this study. Other issues, further development of questions raised here, and refinements of initial findings in this study must be considered in subsequent research.

A seven point scale was used to indicate the frequency with which each respondent perceived a practice to occur at or result from high school institutes. The seven point scale did not measure attitudes toward high school workshops *per se*. Instead, the seven point scale reports perceptions of the incidence of practices—good and bad—at high school workshops. The design of the scale was deliberately chosen to index the perceptions of practices rather than attitudes favoring or criticizing practices. Attitudinal measures are embedded in the wording of the survey statements. For example, it was assumed that the perceptions of a high school debate institute's ability to impart *appropriate* instruction in the development of a ethics of advocacy, stress *poor* rhetorical skills, *distort* student's ability to use logic, etc., were value-laden statements. Thus the extreme wording of the survey items provides evidence of attitudes toward high school workshop practices as well as indications of problems where they might exist.

Accompanying the survey items were instructions for completing the questionnaire. Definitions of terms were provided so that the respondents would be working with the same conceptual understanding of the terms *workshop, students, handbook,* and *staffs.* Sixteen statements concerning high school institute practices were listed. Respondents were asked to place a number in the blank next to the statement. Options for respondents included the numbers one through seven. A key explaining what these numbers meant in terms of incidence of practices was included in the instructions. Seven meant that a particular practice or effect occurred "always"—100% of the time; six meant that a particular practice or effect occurred "almost always"—90% of the time; five meant that a particular practice or effect occurred "very frequently"— at least 75% of the time; four meant that a particular practice or effect occurred "frequently"—at least 50% of the time; three meant that a particular practice or effect occurred "not very frequently"—at least 25% of the time; two meant that a particular practice or effect occurred "hardly ever"—10% of the time or less; and one meant that a particular practice or effect occurred "never"—0% of the time.

The sixteen survey statements addressed five primary issues and three secondary issues. The five primary issues—use of logic, rhetorical skills, ability to explain arguments, ethics of advocacy, and morality of staff—each featured two statements. One statement asked respondents to estimate the frequency with which workshops have a positive effect; the other statement asked respondents to estimate the frequency with which workshops have a negative effect. This method provided an indication of favorable and unfavorable impressions of high school debate workshop practices. Statements relating to the five primary concerns were distributed randomly to guard against bias in response.

Six of the survey items addressed secondary concerns. One statement asked respondents to indicate the frequency with which they thought workshop staffs were adequately trained to provide instruction. One statement inquired into the number of times staff members contributed to the student use of drugs or alcohol. One statement attempted to assess the degree to which high school debate handbooks helped students understand the debate topic. Finally, three statements were used to estimate the degree to which students were responsible for and could take responsibility for their work at institutes.

Demographic questions included: approximately how many students have you had attend workshops; approximately how many students do you have attend workshops each year; how many years of teaching experience do you have; how many years have you coached debate; did you debate in college and for how long; do you coach individual events and for how long? The survey was accompanied by a cover letter.

The sample for the study was composed of four groups. Group 1 consisted of those high school instructors attending the National Forensic League High School National Tournament, June 1984, in San Antonio, Texas. Six hundred and fifty questionnaires were distributed at the NFL National Tournament. Only twenty-two questionnaires were returned. The low rate of response necessitated a revision in data gathering strategy. Hence, the sample was expanded to include two additional groups. Group 2 consisted of instructors who had been enrolled in a summer seminar at a large midwestern university. Names and addresses of the participants for this seminar for the last three years were selected to constitute a portion of the sample. The total number of respondents for this group was twenty-five. Group 3 consisted of contacts provided by a second forensics program in the midwest. The total number of respondents in group 3 was twenty-three. A fourth group was constituted by those respondents who answered a follow-up letter and survey mailed to five hundred of those individuals who had students participating at the NFL National Tournament. The follow-up produced one hundred sixteen more respondents. Of the seven hundred seventy-five people polled, 186 individuals responded, representing a 24% return rate.

Returned questionnaires were coded for computer analysis. In some circumstances respondents indicated ranges. For example, if a respondent indicated that she sends approximately 5-10 students to workshops each summer, the higher value was selected for analysis.

The following variables were considered:

HBG = handbooks help students to understand the topic
GLO = workshops improve students' ability to use logic
GRS = workshops improve rhetorical skills
COA = students research and construct their own arguments
GEA = workshops impart a good ethics of advocacy
BEX = workshops decrease students' ability to explain arguments
BMO = workshops are staffed with individuals who have bad morals
UIA = students return from workshops with arguments whose implications they understand
SDA = workshop staffs contribute to drug and alcohol use by students
GEX = workshops improve students' ability to explain arguments
BEA = workshops impart a bad ethics of advocacy
BRS = workshops diminish students' rhetorical skills
GTS = workshops feature staffs with adequate training for the supervision of high school students
BLO = workshops distort students' ability to use logic
RBH = students are taught to research beyond handbooks at high school debate workshops
GMO = workshops are staffed with individuals who have good morals
SAM = groups composing the sample of the survey
TST = total number of students sent by a particular program
SPY = total number of students sent per year by a program
YTE = total number of years of teaching experience by a respondent
YCD = total number of years of debate coaching experience by a respondent
CDE = total number of years of college debate experience held by a respondent
IEC = total number of years of coaching individual events by a respondent

Frequencies were computed for these variables. Where natural breaks in the data occurred, the data was recoded for the purpose of conducting further analyses.

RESULTS

Three methods of statistical analysis were used to examine the data. Descriptive statistics provided basic distributional characteristics for each survey variable and a demographic analysis of the sample. A oneway analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to assess the effects of each of the seven demographic variables (TST, SPY, YTE, YCD, CDE, IEC, and SAM) upon the sixteen survey items. A criterion of $p \leq .05$ was used to discern significant differences in the effects of each demographic variable. Statistically significant ANOVA results were then reanalyzed using the Student-Newman-Keuls procedure to discover differences in the means within each of the seven demographic variables. Student-Newman-Keuls (SNK) sorts out the means of the groups within each of the demographic variables in order to determine whether the differences between the groups is statistically significant. Results are reported for the demographic analysis of the sample, the descriptive data (means) of each survey item, and the results of the effect of each demographic variable upon the respondents' answers to the survey items.

DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS OF THE SAMPLE

The respondents in the survey were high school forensic coaches. The majority of the instructors had taught twenty years or less (76.9%), with 13.69 years being the average number of years taught. Approximately half of the instructors (60.8%) had coached debate for eleven years, had no college debate experience (49.5%), and had coached individual events for ten years. The results show that the number of students a coach sends per year to high school debate workshops ranged from zero to forty-two with approximately seven (6.8) students being the average. The average total number of students sent to a high school debate workshop during a coach's career was forty-two.

TABLE 1
Overall Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Mean	Mode
HBG	4.52	4.0
GLO	4.17	4.0
GRS	3.03	3.0
COA	4.14	4.0
GEA	3.31	3.0
BEX	3.11	2.0
GMO	2.24	2.0
UIA	3.84	4.0
SDA	2.02	2.0
GEX	4.39	4.0
BEA	2.72	2.0
BRS	4.39	4.0
GTS	4.06	4.0
BLO	3.0	3.0
RBH	4.62	6.0
GMO	4.74	6.0
TST	42.87	20.0
SPY	6.89	3.0
YTE	13.69	13.0
YCD	11.09	10.0
CDE	1.25	0.0
IEC	10.25	4.0

ANALYSIS OF THE MEANS OF THE SURVEY ITEMS

An examination of the means of the survey items revealed several interesting findings. First, high school instructors perceived that fifty percent of the time workshops improved students' ability to use logic (4.17) and explain arguments (4.39), that students research and construct their own arguments (4.14), and that their ability to understand the implications of their arguments improves (3.84). Respondents also indicated that at least twenty-five percent of the time they perceived that workshops imparted a good ethics of advocacy (3.31) and improved rhetorical skills (3.03).

Second, concerning workshop staffs and handbooks, the means indicate that high school coaches feel that fifty percent of the time workshops have adequately trained staffs (4.06) who have good morals (4.74). Less than ten percent of the time coaches feel that workshop staffs contribute to drug and alcohol use by students (2.02). The results also show that fifty to seventy-five percent of the time, coaches feel that handbooks are helpful (4.52) and that students are taught to research beyond handbooks (4.62).

Finally, several negative implications are noted. First, fifty percent of the time respondents claimed that workshops imparted bad rhetorical skills (4.39). Second, ten to twenty-five percent of the time workshops were perceived to promote bad ethics of advocacy (2.72), distort students' ability to use logic (3.0), and decrease students' ability to explain arguments (3.11). Third, ten percent of the time or less, workshops were perceived to be staffed with individuals possessing bad morals for the supervision of high school students (2.24).

In summary, the means indicate that for fifty percent of the time, argumentative skills are perceived to be improved, that workshop staffs are perceived to be adequately trained, and that handbooks are perceived to be beneficial, but that rhetorical skills of students are perceived to decrease.

ANOVA RESULTS

The results of the oneway ANOVA yielded several findings. First, two statistically significant relationships were found concerning the improvement of rhetorical skills (GRS) and the demographic variables YCD ($p \le .012$) and IEC ($p \le .02$). These results indicated that the number of years each respondent coached debate or individual events affected how they replied to the survey item concerning the improvement of rhetorical skills in high school debate workshops. More specifically, the Student-Newman-Keuls procedure revealed that those instructors who had coached debate 6-10 years (2.72), or 11-33 years (2.90) felt that high school debate workshops improved students' rhetorical skills almost twenty-five percent of the time, whereas instructors who coached debate 1-5 years (3.5l) felt that workshops improved rhetorical skills twenty-five to fifty percent of the time. Similar results were found concerning instructors who coached individual events. Those respondents who had coached individual events 12-33 years (2.60) felt that workshops improved students' rhetorical skills only ten to twenty-five percent of the time, whereas respondents who have coached individual events 1-5 years (3.40) felt that workshops improved students' rhetorical skills twenty-five to fifty percent of the time.

Second, two statistically significant effects were found concerning the improvement of argumentative skills and the demographic variables YTE and IEC. These results indicated that the number of years a respondent has taught (YTE) affected how he or she replied to the survey item COA ($p \le .00$); the number of years a respondent has coached individual events (IEC) affected how he or she replied to the survey item GEX ($p \le .00$). Specifically, the Student-Newman-Keuls procedure revealed that those instructors who had taught 1-10 years (4.17) and 11-10 years (4.47) felt that students constructed their own arguments at least fifty percent of the time while instructors who had taught 21-23 years (3.58) felt that students constucted their own arguments twenty-five percent of the time. Second, the Student-Newman-Keuls procedure revealed that respondents who coached individual events 1-5 years (4.37) or 12-33 years (3.94) felt that workshops improved students' explanation of arguments at least fifty percent of the time whereas respondents who coached individual events 6-11 years (4.90) felt that workshops improved students' explanation of arguments at least seventy-five percent of the time.

Two statistically significant effects were found concerning the negative implications of workshops upon students' forensic skills and the demographic variables IEC and YTE. These results

TABLE 2
ANOVA Summary for Sample

Source	df	MS	F	p
HBG				
Between	3	1.38	.64	.59
Within	152	2.14		
Total	155			
GLO				
Between	3	2.35	1.23	.30
Within	152	1.90		
Total	155			
GRS				
Between	3	2.77	1.34	.26
Within	152	2.07		
Total	155			
COA				
Between	3	1.76	1.28	.28
Within	152	1.38		
Total	155			
GEA				
Between	3	1.70	1.00	.39
Within	152	1.69		
Total	155			
BEX				
Between	3	.99	.46	.71
Within	152	2.17		
Total	155			
BMO				
Between	3	1.82	1.17	.32
Within	152	1.56		
Total	155			
UIA				
Between	3	2.23	1.58	.20
Within	152	1.41		
Total	155			
SDA				
Between	3	.41	.34	.80
Within	152	1.22		
Total	155			
GEX				
Between	3	1.55	.79	.50
Within	152	1.96		
Total	155			
BRS				
Between	3	2.73	1.11	.35
Within	152	2.45		
Total	155			
GTS				
Between	3	8.42	3.84	.01
Within	152	2.19		
Total	155			
BEA				
Between	3	1.91	1.50	.23
Within	152	1.30		
Total	155			
BLO				
Between	3	1.62	1.16	.33
Within	152	1.40		
Total	155			
RBH				
Between	3	1.44	.65	.56
Within	152	2.21		
Total	155			
GMO				
Between	3	1.47	.52	.67
Within	152	2.82		
Total	155			

indicated that the number of years a respondent coached individual events affected how he or she replied to the survey item BEA ($p \leq .3$) and the number of years a respondent had taught affected how he or she replied to the survey item BRS ($p \leq .01$). Specifically, the Student-Newman-Keuls procedure revealed that those instuctors who coached individual events 1-5 years (2.46) felt that workshops imparted bad ethics of advocacy ten percent of the time whereas instuctors who had coached individual events 12-33 years (3.01) felt that workshops imparted a bad ethics of advocacy at least twenty-five percent of the time. Second, the Student-Newmn-Keuls procedure revealed that those instructors who had taught 1-10 years (4.16) or 11-10 years (4.33) felt that workshops imparted bad rhetorical skills at least fifty percent of the time, whereas those who taught 21-33 years (5.00) felt that workshops imparted bad rhetorical skills at least twenty-five percent of the time.

Finally, the sample significantly affected perceptions of staff training at high school debate workshops ($p. \leq 01.$). The Student-Newman-Keuls procedure revealed that respondents in group 2, those enrolled in a summer seminar over the last three years at a midwestern univeristy felt that workshop staffs had adequate training fifty to seventy-five percent of the time (4.59), while respondents in group 1 — those respondents answering the survey while attending the NFL National Tournament — felt that workshop staffs had adequate training only twenty-five percent of the time. (3.22). More specifically, respondents in group 1 — those answering the survey while attending the NFL National Tournament — felt the workshops featured adequately trained staffs twenty-five percent of the time (3.22) while respondents answering the follow-up survey felt that staffs were adequately trained fifty percent of the time (4.24).

DISCUSSION

This study was conducted to determine how institutes were perceived by high school instructors. Any interpretation of the results must be considered in light of the nature of the data. Specifically, in no way can these perceptions be taken as evidence of practices and effects in summer institutes. The research questions serve only to identify the image of workshops in the sample surveyed and to indicate which demographic variables are most important in influencing perceptions of high school workshop practices. In this respect, this study is preliminary to understanding what further research needs to be conducted. More study is necessary to determine the effects of high school debate institutes on students and on the high school community. Indeed, as long as controversy remains over what "desirable" forensic practices are, definitive results will not be forthcoming. For the moment, these results help to identify some differences in perceptions of what constitutes desirable practices. Institute directors should take note of marked differences and potential inaccuracies between perceptions and practices where appropriate. Differences of opinion concerning perceived practices should serve as a focal point for dialogue between directors of institutes and the high school instructors. If there are any serious misconceptions, then attention should be devoted to discovering the reasons so that remedies may be offered for improving the image of the high school debate workshop experience.

Respondents were most positive on the subject of handbooks, perceiving them to be helpful to students fifty to seventy-five percent of the time. Further, the results indicated that high school instructors thought that workshops taught students to research beyond handbooks fifty to seventy-five percent of the time. These results suggest that those instructors perceived handbooks to be performing an important educational role in preparing students for the debate season; and that workshops impart a positive attitude toward research beyond the confines of the summer experience. Further research should be conducted to determine what aspects of handbooks instructors perceive to be most instructional for high school students. It would also be helpful to know the extent to which institutes create a motivation for future research on a debate topic. If workshops are peceived to uniquely enhance a student's desire to learn on his or her own, then directors should determine what elements of the institute experience are responsible for those effects, augmenting them where possible.

TABLE 3
ANOVA Summary for Years of Coaching Debate Experience

Source	df	MS	F	p
HBG				
Between	2	2.71	1.42	.24
Within	180	1.91		
Total	182			
GLO				
Between	2	3.60	1.86	.16
Within	180	1.93		
Total	182			
GRS				
Between	2	8.69	4.12	.012
Within	180	2.11		
Total	182			
COA				
Between	2	0.83	.58	.56
Within	180	1.43		
Total	182			
GEA				
Between	2	3.46	1.93	.15
Within	180	1.79		
Total	182			
BEX				
Between	2	2.43	1.1	.34
Within	180	2.21		
Total	182			
BMO				
Between	2	4.20	2.45	.09
Within	180	1.72		
Total	182			
UIA				
Between	2	.64	.43	.65
Within	180	1.50		
Total	182			
SDA				
Between	2	2.94	2.01	.14
Within	180	1.46		
Total	182			
GEX				
Between	2	3.57	1.79	.17
Within	180	2.0		
Total	182			
BRS				
Between	2	6.38	2.75	.07
Within	180	2.34		
Total	182			
GTS				
Between	2	1.06	.44	.64
Within	180	2.39		
Total	182			
BEA				
Between	2	.87	.64	.53
Within	180	1.37		
Total	182			
BLO				
Between	2	3.53	2.39	.094
Within	180	1.48		
Total	182			
RBH				
Between	2	1.18	.53	.59
Within	180	2.21		
Total	182			
GMO				
Between	2	1.52	.51	.60
Within	180	2.98		
Total	182			

Second, the results indicated that high school instructors perceived institutes to improve three out of the five skill areas identified in this survey. Specifically, instructors thought that workshops improved students' use of logic, their ability to explain arguments, their ability to construct their own arguments and understand the implications of their arguments fifty percent of the time. This is quite encouraging considering the nature of the survey did not inquire whether the fault with the other fifty percent lies with the student or the curricula. One important variable in an instructor's perception is the motivation, interest, and productivity level of the students. It is difficult to imagine that all students approach high school workshops with the same degree of intensity. Consequently, this perception does not necessarily reflect any problems in workshop curricula. Instead, further study must be devoted to determining how workshops affect students over time. In the interim, institute directors should review their curricula and instructional philosophy. Workshops should develop their own set of goals framed in an institutional philosophy of forensics pedagogy—a set of educational assumptions a staff can consult and strive to implement in their own contact with students, as well as a document that can be examined by interested parents and teachers.

Third, concerning institute staffs, the results indicated that instructors perceived summer staffs to be adequately trained and composed of individuals with sound morals fifty percent of the time. These results are also encouraging indicating no perceptions of widespread dissatisfaction with staff training and character. The results also indicated that teachers perceived no significant incidence of alcohol and drug use contributed by staff members, and no significant incidence in the compromise of student morals. At worst, incidence of these problems was limited ten percent of the time *or less*. Here it is important to note one limitation of the survey instrument. If, for example, a respondent knew of only one incidence out of a hundred, or heard of a particular incident, ten percent of the time or less was indicated. Consequently, the perception of occurrence of these problems may be much less than ten percent. There is no way of knowing the actual perceived occurrence of these problems within the boundaries of the scale items used in the survey instrument. Generally, however, these results suggest that there is no major problem perceived by instructors concerning staff training and morals. It is important to note also, though, that there is room for improving staff images. Because high school students are impressionable, because staff members are in positions of power, and because staff members function as role models, any *perceived* contribution to alcohol or drug abuse, or unethical actions on the part of staff members deserves attention by workshops directors. Where appropriate, directors should develop behavioral guidelines for the role of instructor so that parents and educators can examine the professional standards of each institute. Finally, if this perception is inaccurate, if directors can [illegible] with confidence that *all* of their staff members reflect the highest ethics and principles of professionalism and that there has never been any incidence of alcohol or drug use, or possibility of an unethical action on the part of a staff member, then some action must be taken to dispel the idea that staffs are well trained and composed of sound morals only fifty percent of the time.

Fourth, instructors perceived workshops improving rhetorical skills only twenty-five percent of the time. This perception is reinforced by the fact that respondents perceived workshops to impart poor rhetorical skills fifty percent of the time. Though this finding seems alarming, when one notes that the operational definition of poor rhetorical techniques was given as "excessively fast rates of delivery," it comes as no surprise. High school debate tournament audiences differ radically from high school debate workshop audiences. During summer institutes students may be learning how to adapt to audiences emphasizing substantive over rhetorical elements. As a result, high school students bring back highly developed cognitive skills but underdeveloped rhetorical abilities as perceived by instructors. This is a curious finding since instructors perceived workshops to improve students' ability to explain their arguments, to construct and understand the implications of their arguments fifty percent of the time. Presumably, one who can construct and explain the implications of an argument would possess enhanced rhetorical ability. However, when one considers poor

TABLE 4
ANOVA Summary for College Debate Experience

Source	df	MS	F	p
HBG				
Between	4	1.88	1.03	.39
Within	89	1.82		
Total	93			
GLO				
Between	4	3.13	1.73	.15
Within	89	1.00		
Total	93			
GRS				
Between	4	2.30	1.02	.40
Within	89	2.25		
Total	93			
COA				
Between	4	2.02	1.36	.25
Within	89	1.48		
Total	93			
GEA				
Between	4	.78	.45	.77
Within	89	1.72		
Total	93			
BEX				
Between	4	6.65	2.62	.04
Within	89	2.54		
Total	93			
BMO				
Between	4	1.65	1.05	.39
Within	89	1.57		
Total	93			
UIA				
Between	4	2.99	2.40	.056
Within	89	1.25		
Total	93			
SDA				
Between	4	1.14	.75	.56
Within	89	1.51		
Total	93			
GEX				
Between	4	2.67	1.33	.27
Within	89	2.01		
Total	93			
BRS				
Between	4	2.60	1.17	.33
Within	89	2.23		
Total	93			
GTS				
Between	4	1.27	.58	.68
Within	89	2.12		
Total	93			
BEA				
Between	4	2.98	2.33	.06
Within	89	1.27		
Total	93			
BLO				
Between	4	5.44	3.56	.01
Within	89	1.53		
Total	93			
RBH				
Between	4	2.88	1.20	.31
Within	89	2.39		
Total	93			
GMO				
Between	4	4.62	1.55	.20
Within	89	2.98		
Total	93			

rhetorical technique in terms of excessive rates of delivery, instructors perceived workshops to be culpable. What does this mean? First, these results indicate that teachers value the ability to adapt to community audiences equally as essential to a debater's education as his or her ability to construct sound arguments. Second, if institutes are giving attention to rhetorical skills in their curricula, e.g., when to use fast or slow rates of delivery, how to adapt a complex argument to an audience's limited background knowledge, how to establish a context for understanding a series of complex issues, etc., high school instructors do not perceive these elements to be a part of the workshop curricula. Directors should improve their image if the case is untrue, and act to enhance rhetorical skills where gaps in the curricula are discovered.

Workshops are perceived to have a marginal effect on imparting a desirable ethics of advocacy. Respondents perceived institutes to impart desirable ethics of advocacy ten to twenty-five percent of the time and to promote an undesirable ethics of advocacy ten to twenty-five percent of the time. The fact that workshops are not perceived to significantly harm ethics is encouraging. It should be noted by institute directors, however, that attention should be given to improving the image of workshops in the area of imparting a desirable ethics of advocacy, especially if institutes strongly discourage such practices as fabricating, altering, or distorting evidence in any way.

Finally, instructors perceived workshops to have a slight negative influence in the development of students' ability to use logic and explain arguments. The results indicated that instructors perceived workshops to distort students' ability to use logic and decrease students' ability to explain arguments ten to twenty-five percent of the time. One explanation for this result may be that high school debaters often receive instruction in workshops from college debaters. As instructors, college debaters may be training high school debaters to debate for college critics. Unlike community audiences, college debaters and critics often spend a great deal of time studying the high school debate topic in preparation for their role as instructors. As a result, college critics do not necessarily need as much explanation or clarity in the presentation of an argument; they can fill in a poorly developed argument with their own knowledge of the topic. It is important to note, however, that the college critic is not the audience high school students will be addressing. In many circumstances students will be addressing members of their community. Consequently, high school debaters who are technically superior in terms of developing concisely packaged and extensively structured arguments for college critics, in some circumstances, may not be taking the time necessary to unpack the reasoning, assumptions, and background knowledge necessary to persuade a lay audience. Interpreted in this context, perceptions concerning rhetorical skills, use of logic, and ability to explain arguments can be changed if institutes strengthen the commitment in their curricula to instruction in the areas of rhetorical skills, explanation of logical relationships, and the ability to explain and critique methods of reasoning.

The second research question tried to determine the influence of demographic variables on the perceptions of problems in high school workshops. The results indicated that the group characteristics composing the sample affected only the perception of staff training. The fact that group number two, those respondents affiliated with a high school debate instructors' seminar at a midwestern university, viewed workshop staffs more favorably was interesting. This result suggests that high school instructors who have an opportunity to directly observe the administration of a summer institute and the degree of supervision provided by staffs may tend to have a more positive perception of workshop practices than instructors who are unfamiliar with workshop practices. This inference must be qualified, however, because the results reflect the experience of a small group of instructors concerning one institutional seminar over a three-year period. None of the other demographic variables influenced the perceptions of staff training in a statistically significant way, however.

Second, the number of students sent to institutes per year by a high school debate program and the total number of students sent in the history of a respondent's career as a forensics director did not

TABLE 5
ANOVA Summary for Years Teaching Experience

Source	df	MS	F	p
HBG				
Between	2	5.26	2.85	.06
Within	179	1.85		
Total	181			
GLO				
Between	2	5.01	2.63	.08
Within	179	1.91		
Total	181			
GRS				
Between	2	4.32	1.98	.14
Within	179	2.19		
Total	181			
COA				
Between	2	10.59	8.04	.00
Within	179	1.32		
Total	181			
GEA				
Between	2	3.82	2.16	.12
Within	179	1.77		
Total	181			
BEX				
Between	2	3.47	1.57	.21
Within	179	2.21		
Total	181			
BMO				
Between	2	2.57	1.49	.23
Within	179	1.72		
Total	181			
UIA				
Between	2	1.99	1.35	.26
Within	179	1.47		
Total	181			
SDA				
Between	2	2.82	1.88	.16
Within	179	1.50		
Total	181			
GEX				
Between	2	4.82	2.40	.09
Within	179	2.01		
Total	181			
BRS				
Between	2	9.87	4.43	.01
Within	179	2.23		
Total	181			
GTS				
Between	2	4.61	1.99	.14
Within	179	2.31		
Total	181			
BEA				
Between	2	1.81	1.33	.27
Within	179	1.36		
Total	181			
BLO				
Between	2	4.28	2.92	.056
Within	179	1.47		
Total	181			
RBH				
Between	2	4.29	1.99	.14
Within	179	2.16		
Total	181			
GMO				
Between	2	2.48	.84	.43
Within	179	2.95		
Total	181			

affect perceptions. Instructors who send few or no students to workshops did not differ significantly from teachers who send as many as forty.

Third, the number of years of college debate experience did not affect perceptions of workshops in a significant way. Former debaters did not necessarily perceive workshop practices any differently than nondebaters.

The demographic variables which did influence perceptions of practices were the numbers of years of teaching experience, number of years of debate coaching experience, and the number of years of coaching individual events. With respect to the number of years of debate coaching, the results indicated that the longer one has coached debate, the less favorably he or she perceived high school debate workshops improving rhetorical skills. This impression may be due to the changes that have taken place in the style of delivery at the college level over the last decade. One trend in college debate has been to deemphasize rhetorical flourish with the intent of improving the substantive quality of argument. This emphasis may be transferred to high school students in the implicit educational philosophies of college debaters and debate coaches who work in high school workshops. As a result, what may have been a once familiar form of debate for high school instructors—a form emphasizing style and clarity first and substantive complexity second—becomes deemphasized, and is transformed in the workshop experience to a form of debate which emphasizes substantive complexity over style. Results concerning the influence of individual events coaching experience on the perception of rhetorical skills are similar. Both findings point to the conclusion that the longer respondents have coached debate and individual events, the less favorably they perceive high school debate workshops in terms of improving rhetorical skills.

The demographic variable of individual events coaching also affected the way respondents perceived workshops in terms of students' ability to explain arguments. The longer respondents have coached individual events, the less favorably they perceived workshops to be improving explanatory skills. Suprisingly, those individuals in the two groups who have coached the least (one to five years) and the most (twelve to thirty-three years) viewed workshops least favorably while the group with intermediate coaching experience (six to ten years) were most favorable, perceiving workshops to improve explanatory skills almost seventy-five percent of the time. The nature of the survey makes any explanation of this finding difficult. The result does indicate, however, that perceptions of workshops change over time. More research is needed to determined how initial perceptions of institutes are formed, on what basis these impressions are formed, what practices account for their change, and why they deteriorate over time.

Individual events coaching experience also affected how respondents perceived workshops in terms of ethical training. Individuals with one to five years of individual events coaching perceived workshops to impart poor ethics better than ten percent of the time while those respondents with twelve to thirty years of individual events coaching experience perceived workshops to impart undesirable ethics at least twenty-five percent of the time. A similar pattern forms with respect to the perception of improving rhetorical skills. The least experienced individual events coaches perceived workshops to improve rhetorical skills twenty-five to fifty percent of the time. Respondents with twelve to thirty-three years of experience, however, perceived workshops to improve rhetorical skills only ten to twenty-five percent of the time. This suggests that individual events coaches view debate workshops less favorably over time in terms of ethics and rhetorical skills. These results are consistent with the effect that the number of years of coaching debate has on rhetorical skills. The longer one has coached forensics, the less favorably he or she perceives workshops to improve rhetorical skills and develop a desirable ethics of advocacy in students. In some respects, these results may be a function of the sample. Teachers with twelve to thirty years of experience have a much wider range of experience to reflect on. Further study is needed to determine why these perceptions become less favorable over time.

The number of years of teaching experience influenced perceptions of workshops in terms of their ability to train students to construct their own arguments. The pattern was similar to the effect of

TABLE 6
ANOVA Summary for Total Students Sent to Workshop

Source	df	MS	F	p
HBG				
Between	3	1.22	.67	.57
Within	175	1.82		
Total	178			
GLO				
Between	3	2.58	1.38	.25
Within	175	1.87		
Total	178			
GRS				
Between	3	4.07	1.89	.13
Within	175	2.16		
Total	178			
COA				
Between	3	3.50	2.66	.05
Within	175	1.32		
Total	178			
GEA				
Between	3	2.63	1.50	.22
Within	175	1.75		
Total	178			
BEX				
Between	3	2.29	1.05	.37
Within	175	2.17		
Total	178			
BMO				
Between	3	4.67	2.79	.04
Within	175	1.68		
Total	178			
UIA				
Between	3	2.33	1.70	.17
Within	175	1.37		
Total	178			
SDA				
Between	3	1.40	.92	.43
Within	175	1.52		
Total	178			
GEX				
Between	3	2.03	1.09	.36
Within	175	1.87		
Total	178			
BRS				
Between	3	.47	.20	.90
Within	175	2.35		
Total	178			
GTS				
Between	3	2.26	1.02	.38
Within	175	2.21		
Total	178			
BEA				
Between	3	2.23	1.73	.16
Within	175	1.29		
Total	178			
BLO				
Between	3	1.68	1.16	.33
Within	175	1.45		
Total	178			
RBH				
Between	3	2.33	1.13	.34
Within	175	2.06		
Total	178			
GMO				
Between	3	.89	.32	.81
Within	175	2.76		
Total	178			

individual events coaching experience on perceptions of workshops in improving explanatory skills. Respondents with the middle range of experience perceived workshops most favorably in terms of teaching students to construct their own arguments while those respondents with the least and most teaching experience viewed workshops least favorably. Again, more research is necessary to determine how these perceptions form, and what causes them to change over time.

Years of teaching experience also affected the degree to which respondents perceived workshops to impart poor rhetorical skills. The relationship is consistent over time. Respondents with one to ten years of experience perceived workshops to teach poor rhetorical skills at least fifty percent of the time; respondents with eleven to twenty years of teaching experience perceived poor rhetorical training to result more than fifty percent of the time. Most significantly, however, individuals with twenty-one to thirty-three years of teaching experience perceived workshops to impart undesirable rhetorical skills at least seventy-five percent of the time. These findings may simply point to the clash between habits of delivery and instruction which are time-tested versus the innovations which are being developed at the college level and transferred to the high school level during summer workshops. Teachers who have been coaching for many years may simply resent innovations which seem to subvert the rhetorical dimension of the debate activity. Again, summer institute directors need to be cognizant of the substantial emphasis placed on rhetorical skills in the high school debate activity.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

As noted previously, these results must be interpreted conservatively. Because of the nature of the sample, limitations in the measurement scale, and the fact that these are perceptions, not reports of direct observation of incidences, more study is necessary to determine the actual ways in which high school debate workshops affect students. Generally, the results from this survey suggest that high school instructors perceive summer debate institutes to advance students' cognitive abilities in the construction of arguments, use of logic, and explanation of arguments. Further, these results indicate that staff training and ethics are not perceived to be major problems from the instructor's perspective. Instead, the major concern for high school teachers is in the area of rhetorical skills and ethics of advocacy.

Directors of high school institutes should consider the image that high school instructors have of summer workshops. While the results suggest that high school instructors perceive summer institutes to enhance cognitive skills, the same cannot be said of rhetorical skills and ethics. Workshop directors should give attention to correcting these perceptions either through greater dialogue with instructors at the high school level—if these perceptions are inaccurate—or by altering curricula where necessary to give greater emphasis to instruction in rhetorical skills and ethics. Three specific recommendations might enhance the quality of dialogue between secondary and college level instructors. First, workshops should have clearly stated professional standards so that staff members as well as parents and teachers can understand each institute's professional expectation for staff members. Second summer institutes should clarify their educational philosophy so that parents and teachers can examine the instructional values of workshops. Third, directors should review their curricula to determine how well they meet their specific educational goals and the degree to which they operationalize their instructional values.

Finally, more research is needed to determine the cognitive effects of debate training on students, what effects high school workshop practices have on the high school community, how these perceptions of practices form and why they change over time, and why those instructors with the most teaching and coaching experience viewed workshops least favorably. Research should also be devoted to determining what aspects of high school handbooks instructors find most educational. The results of this survey indicated that handbooks were perceived to be helpful to students fifty to seventy-five percent of the time. But because handbooks differ in format and content, more research is necessary to determine how and why they are perceived so favorably by high school instructors.

TABLE 7
ANOVA Summary for Individual Events Coaching

Source	df	MS	F	p
HBG				
Between	2	1.82	.97	.38
Within	169	1.87		
Total	171			
GLO				
Between	2	4.40	2.278	.11
Within	169	1.93		
Total	171			
GRS				
Between	2	8.14	3.81	.02
Within	169	2.13		
Total	171			
COA				
Between	2	2.07	1.41	.25
Within	169	1.46		
Total	171			
GEA				
Between	2	3.17	1.72	.18
Within	169	1.85		
Total	171			
BEX				
Between	2	2.91	1.32	.27
Within	169	2.20		
Total	171			
BMO				
Between	2	1.42	.83	.44
Within	169	1.72		
Total	171			
UIA				
Between	2	.77	.52	.59
Within	169	1.47		
Total	171			
SDA				
Between	2	1.18	.78	.46
Within	169	1.51		
Total	171			
GEX				
Between	2	13.65	7.34	.00
Within	169	1.86		
Total	171			
BRS				
Between	2	7.26	3.20	.04
Within	169	2.27		
Total	171			
GTS				
Between	2	5.84	2.52	.08
Within	169	2.32		
Total	171			
BEA				
Between	2	4.54	3.46	.03
Within	169	1.31		
Total	171			
BLO				
Between	2	4.22	2.84	.06
Within	169	1.49		
Total	171			
RBH				
Between	2	3.75	1.77	.17
Within	169	2.12		
Total	171			
GMO				
Between	2	1.15	.40	.67
Within	169	2.91		
Total	171			

In conclusion, high school workshops are perceived to be a valuable source of instructions in argumentation skills and an important opportunity for advanced research in the topic area. If summer institutes are to remain an important dimension of a high school debater's season preparation, directors must address themselves to the perceived problems in rhetorical skills and ethics. In developing a closer relationship with high school instructors, institute directors might come to better understand the unique and important role workshops play in preparing students for competition.

TABLE 8
ANOVA Summary for Students Per Year Sent to Workshops

Source	df	MS	F	p
HBG				
Between	2	.92	.48	.62
Within	183	1.92		
Total	185			
GLO				
Between	2	2.60	1.34	.26
Within	183	1.94		
Total	185			
GRS				
Between	2	2.68	1.24	.29
Within	183	2.16		
Total	185			
COA				
Between	2	1.02	.72	.49
Within	183	1.41		
Total	185			
GEA				
Between	2	2.13	1.19	.31
Within	183	1.79		
Total	185			
BEX				
Between	2	2.98	1.36	.26
Within	183	2.20		
Total	185			
BMO				
Between	2	.44	.25	.78
Within	183	1.78		
Total	185			
UIA				
Between	2	1.72	1.16	.32
Within	183	1.48		
Total	185			
SDA				
Between	2	2.01	1.34	.26
Within	183	1.50		
Total	185			
GEX				
Between	2	2.76	1.38	.25
Within	183	2.00		
Total	185			
BRS				
Between	2	3.29	1.40	.25
Within	183	2.35		
Total	185			
GTS				
Between	2	.72	.30	.74
Within	183	2.42		
Total	185			
BEA				
Between	2	.82	.61	.54
Within	183	1.35		
Total	185			
BLO				
Between	2	.82	.55	.58
Within	183	1.49		
Total	185			
RBH				
Between	2	3.57	1.66	.19
Within	183	2.16		
Total	185			
GMO				
Between	2	.18	.06	.94
Within	183	2.97		
Total	185			

Chapter IX
Individual Events

A. *Order and Diversity: The Search for Judging Standards in Individual Events*

John Murphy

In the last ten years, individual events has experienced considerable growth. While that expansion signals the existence of a strong, healthy activity, it also brings with it the problems associated with a period of high growth. Old concerns seem to expand right along with the activity and new concerns appear with regularity. During the last few years there has been an increased effort to deal with these problems. From the creation of a new journal to this conference itself, members of the individual events community have sought to identify and ameliorate at least some of the concerns that have troubled them. The work group on individual events at the National Developmental Conference on Forensics attempted to clarify and standardize the criteria for judging individual events. Clearly, the group could not hope to resolve all of the concerns during a short conference. Instead, group deliberations revolved around four major areas. This paper will review, first, the discussion concerning judging standards; second, the concerns over ballot construction; third, the suggestions about tournament structure; and, finally, the problems expressed about judges themselves. The work group on individual events attempted to touch on major areas of problems that exist within the activity and to provide some suggestions to alleviate those problems.

The first area of concern, the standards for judging individual events, dominated the discussions and the resolutions grew mainly out of these deliberations. Not surprisingly, disagreements emerged almost immediately. Some group members seemed uncomfortable with a clear standardization of guidelines. Bartanen, for instance, felt "that there are advantages to diversity in the events offered, event descriptions, and judging perspectives which make uniformity and standardization undesirable goals of our deliberations." Porter offered a survey comparison of rankings given by hired judges and coaches and the 1984 AFA-NIET. The result of her study indicated that the disagreement among judges was not as high as is commonly thought. As she noted, "variances in individual events judging are not as serious as the forensic community feared." Others took a quite different view. Murphy, Armstrong and Sudhoff, and Larson clearly accepted the need for specific event guidelines. The position of Murphy, Armstrong and Sudhoff dealt specifically with the Extemporaneous Speaking event, arguing for criteria that might be used to judge the event. Larson maintained that all of the events needed much more specific descriptions and criteria, using communication analysis as her prime example. Taking the middle road, Hanson and Schnoor both maintained that group effort could most profitably be spent developing general guidelines for the oral interpretation events and the public speaking events. The final resolutions of the group reflected this middle ground. The group sought to draw up standards that would preserve the creativity so apparent in individual events, while providing the judge with enough information to write useful comments on the ballot If these standards were widely adopted and used, the work group felt they would direct the attention of judges to the crucial areas of the student's performance.

Group members also expressed concern about the educational value of individual events and about the effect of the standards on the educational goals of the activity. Larson, in particular, focused on this problem. She argued that the current event guidelines do very little guiding. If students do not know what they are supposed to accomplish, then the activity probably has failed to teach them very much. Another section of the discussion examined the events themselves. Do they exist for any particular purpose beyond tradition? What specific educational goals are accomplished by each event? While the work group did not have time to fully address those questions, they are important educational issues and deserve further serious consideration. Finally, in connection with this concern, several of the members expressed some discontent about the proliferation of new events. If a tournament creates new events, it was felt that the director should have some idea what these events are supposed to accomplish. McGee, for instance, argued that tournaments should be perfectly free to experiment, but that these nuance events should not count for national qualification. Moreover, several of the members commented that it is difficult enough to develop expertise in the existing events, much less new and different ones. While everyone supported experimentation, all felt that these new events should have clearly stated goals and criteria to guide participants and judges.

Ballot construction constituted a second area of concern. There currently exists no national ballot as such in individual events. Ballots differ widely from week to week throughout the year and between the two national tournaments. While this diversity concerned the group to some extent, the principles used in constructing ballots received greater attention. The simple problem of space came up immediately. It was the consensus of the group that many tournament ballots do not provide the room necessary for adequate comments. The rating scale used by many tournaments also caused concern, as Dunlap stated:

> The rating scale is heir to similar faults. The lack of uniformity of the number ranges (1-10, 1-25, 1-30, 1-100) forestalls the application of conventionally agreed upon point values for achieving certain goals or for failing to meet certain expectations, either for a single judge or nationally. There also remains the unexamined question of whom the students are being ranked against. others in the round, others in competition, or others in college. Until issues of uniformity of scale and uniformity of comparison are settled, these rating scales will be of limited use.

Finally, the most controversial issues concerned the use of printed standards on the ballot. Some members wanted the guidelines to be placed on the ballot, and others opposed this. The consensus of the group seemed to be that the guidelines for evaluation should be on the ballot but they not be binding on the judge. No boxed or point values should be assigned for the accomplishment of each guideline. At the same time, the group wished to encourage experimentation with ballot design. If one area of tournament direction has been ignored, it has been ballot construction. Quite often, the configuration of the ballot seems to match the paper available. While practicality is important, tournaments should use ballots which provide the guidance and space necessary for an adequate written evaluation from the judge.

The group also felt that the tournament itself should provide the best atmosphere possible for good judging. The foremost obstacle to achieving this goal is time. Several papers noted the fact that most tournament schedules simply did not allow the time necessary to write good, clear ballots. As Dunlap noted: "The tight schedules of most tournaments also pose problems for adequate criticism by limiting time for ballot writing, judge-contestant interaction, and professional discussions of judging philosophy." Certainly, the choices to be made in dealing with this problem are difficult and complex. Do tournaments limit the number of entries? That may provide more time, but it would also lessen student participation in the activity. Should tournaments simply take longer? Again, more time, but also more expense. In the tradition of compromise, all agreed that tournaments should make the best possible use of the time available. Thus, the group felt that discussions or seminars could take place in the dead time between the end of the final rounds and the awards assembly. This could involve oral critiques of the final round, or it could mean a lecture/discussion on a particular event. Lunch seminars for judges could also be one way of discussing standards, while not drastically altering tournament schedules. In any event, all members endorsed the idea of judge seminars. As McGee wrote: "Though such workshops are not guarantees of better quality judging, they do provide an avenue for dialogue between judges."

Clearly, the most important issues apart from the standards, involved the actions and the role of the judge. Standards mean very little if the actual judge in a round does not use them properly or fails to write full and complete ballots. A number of problems with current judging practices appeared in the various papers. Several people noted the problem of regional diversity. Judges evaluate differently in various parts of the country, and even the same standards can mean different things to different people. Porter and Dunlap noted that the judgments themselves are not the problem. Most critics performed reasonably well at deciding the actual rankings. Porter's survey of the AFA-NIET results indicated a fairly clear consensus in many of the rounds on the winner. It is in writing of reasons for the decisions that many judges seem to have some problems. Hanson noted another difficult dilemma:

> Additional criticisms surrounding judgments made in a round of competition stem from charges of politics and prejudice. Politically, a speaker sometimes feels that she/he has received a divergent judgment because the judge(s) in the round disliked the contestant and/or the school the contestant represented.

The group was also concerned with the problem of lay or community judges. While the desirability of a variety of perspectives was recognized, the group believed that maximum educational objectives are achieved when expert judges and standards are utilized. Hanson made the strongest statement of opposition to the use of lay judges:

> Should the lay-person be used as a judge? Not if one believes that the evaluation of students is an educational activity. Is it reasonable to expect the barber to do the mechanical work on one's car? The use of lay-judges unskilled in the critical evaluation of students engaged in the mastery of the art and craft of oral communication is a genuine disservice to the student's educational growth.

While not all members agreed with this strong position, most felt that if a tournament used any lay judges, the director had an obligation to do the best job possible to train those judges in the evaluation of students.

Finally, the issue of oral critiques of students was discussed by the work group. Everyone seemed to feel that oral critiques are great in theory but that care must be taken in using them. First, with the current system of multiple entries, it is difficult to schedule oral critiques so that students receive the opportunity to hear them. Second, novice students may feel crushed by a critique in the early rounds of a tournament when they cannot make any adjustments in a speech that was reviewed badly. Finally, the time factor of the tournaments again enters in to the discussion. One possible solution is an oral critique of the final round by the judges. Such an approach could solve some of the difficulties listed above.

As for the other judging problems, the group sought to affirm the role of an individual events judge as an educator-critic. Bartanen and Dunlap argued that judges incur certain responsibilities by their acceptance of the task. They emphasized that judges are obligated to provide written comments to explain the student's ranking. Moreover, the judge should provide constructive suggestions for improving the performance of the student. Too often, ballots only briefly explain the decision without offering any criticism that the student can use to learn from the experience. As an example, Murphy noted that ballots for extemporaneous speaking often tend to argue with the student's position on the question rather than critiquing the argument. The focus of the ballot should be on the art and craft of oral communication. If participation in individual events is to provide educational benefits for the competitor, the ballots should reflect that goal.

The work group did not have time to cover even a small number of the issues in individual events, nor did it feel that it was sufficiently representative to tackle such problems as the relationship between the two national tournaments. Individual events has grown to such an extent that a few people on a few panels cannot adequately deal with the organizational and substantive questions that surround the activity. Thus the group encouraged a National Individual Events

Conference to be held. The other resolutions respond to the problems cited above. They flow from the fact that we believe individual events tournaments to be "educational laboratories for increased understanding of, appreciation for, and skill in the art/craft of oral communication." The standards presented in the first resolution are simply intended to be a framework for criticism. While they do not cover all of the issues, they can provide important touchstones for judges. As indicated above, the second resolution affirms the role of the judges. The fourth resolution seeks to obtain the best possible educational atmosphere for students at tournaments and help solve problems regarding tournament structure and judging. Finally, the fifth resolution is aimed at providing models for students and judges to learn from. It simply authorizes an exploration of the possibility of a video and transcript library, recognizing that copyright problems may exist. In short, the group could not seek to solve all of the problems of the individual events community. At the same time, these five resolutions offer some useful suggestions for the clarification of individual events judging standards.

B. RESOLUTIONS

45. THE FOLLOWING GENERAL STANDARDS SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL EVENTS

PUBLIC ADDRESS

1. The speaker's presentation should identify a thesis or claim from which the speech is developed;
2. The speaker's presentation should provide a motivational link (relevance factor) between the topic and the audience;
3. The speaker's presentation should develop a substantive analysis of the thesis using appropriate supporting materials;
4. The speaker's presentation should be organized in a coherent manner;
5. The speaker's presentation should use language which is appropriate for the topic and the audience;
6. The speaker's presentation should be delivered using appropriate vocal and physical presentational skills.

ORAL INTERPRETATION OF LITERATURE

1. The interpreter's program should communicate an apparent purpose/justification for the literature selected;
2. The interpreter's program should communicate a motivational link (relevance factor) between the selection and the audience;
3. The interpreter's program should maintain the ethical integrity of the literature;
4. The interpreter's program should display an understanding of thematic development and a sense of continuity in the presentation;
5. The interpreter's program should be delivered using appropriate vocal and physical presentational skills which enhance rather than detract from the literature.

Individual events tournaments are educational laboratories for increasing understanding of, appreciation for, and skill in the art of oral communication. In recent years there has been increasing confusion over judging standards in individual events. Judges have not been clear on the criteria used for judging the various events. This resolution seeks to clarify standards in public address and in the oral interpretation of literature. These standards of evaluation are intended to provide a framework of criticism. Clearly, event guidelines and tournament rules should be considered in the final ranking of contestants in a particular round. However, these standards will allow students to understand what they are supposed to accomplish and learn. These standards reflect well established rhetorical principles which transcend the particular events. These standards should provide a framework for more coherent evaluation of student performances.

49. NATIONAL, REGIONAL, AND STATE FORENSIC ASSOCIATIONS SHOULD ASSIST IN FACILITATING THE DISSEMINATION OF STANDARDS OF GOOD PERFORMANCE BY INVESTIGATING THE FEASIBILITY OF DEVELOPING A LIBRARY OF VIDEO-TAPED AND/OR PRINTED COPIES OF OUTSTANDING STUDENT PERFORMANCE.

Each of the respective organizations should investigate their own means of acquiring the models and providing for the dissemination of such models. Models of good performance can be used for improving student performances and judging evaluations. Models for purpose of training students in the art of oral communication and training critic evaluators will contribute to an improved learning laboratory experience.

C. COMMENTS FROM POSITION PAPERS

DAVID DUNLAP (UNIVERSITY OF IOWA). The greatest challenge facing individual events is not increasing the competence of its judges, but rather in increasing the competence of its critics. Tournament directors still give an entire piece of paper to judges in the sometimes naive belief that the space will be filled . . . Each time a student receives a ballot that contains only rank and rating, that student has been cheated.

C. T. HANSON (NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY). Perhaps more than any other criticism, the forensic community is especially vulnerable on the issue of judge competency. Quality has been sacrificed on numerous occasions in tournaments to accommodate efficiency of tournament operation and to accommodate a large quantity of entries . . . Often forgotten in the scurry . . . is the fact that the judge has a principal role to play, that of an educator . . . Creating a condition of competency in a critic necessitates as much, if not more, educational training than does creating a condition of competency in the forensic competitor.

SHAWN L. MCGEE (MICHIGAN BELL TELEPHONE). A joint committee of officials of the NFA and AFA-NIET should be formed to devise a ballot for each national qualifying event . . . A standard ballot could be made available to local tournament directors. Each ballot would suggest the event description and suggested criteria for evaluation.

JOHN MURPHY (UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS). The time has come to focus on the argument forms and decision rules that characterize each event. By doing this, we may be able to concentrate on specific actions that will improve the quality of each event, rather than giving general guidelines that may or may not apply in actual situations.

LARRY G. SCHNOOR (MANKATO STATE UNIVERSITY). Tournaments should be encouraged to develop professional seminars at which judging standards and methods of evaluation are presented. These seminars should be scheduled at a time when all participants and coaches/judges may attend.

GEORGE ARMSTRONG AND STEVE SUDHOFF (BRADLEY UNIVERSITY). In general, judging standards for public speaking events should be based upon two types of speech characteristics. First, the judges should base their evaluations upon how well the speech adheres to general principles of public address . . . Second, evaluations should also be formulated based upon the unique characteristics of the specific speaking event.

SUZANNE LARSON (HUMBOLT STATE UNIVERSITY). Debate and argumentation definitely have overlapping boundaries, but the emphasis on argumentation in individual events, although useful for some events, such as persuasion or communication analysis, is inadequate for many other individual events . . . This focus on argument is too narrow and confining and needs to be broadened.

KRISTINE M. BARTANEN (UNIVERSITY OF PUGET SOUND). My concern is that the quest for uniform judging criteria may be a product of desire for, or contribute to a generation of, a series of formulas—equal in number to the number of nationally sanctioned events—for "the winning extemp," "the championship interp," etc. Wherever the starting point, production of such formulas stifles creativity, mechanizes an artistic endeavor, and makes the forensics coach little more than a teacher of declamation.

SHARON PORTER (NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY). Recommendations could be provided to assist in alleviating the tournament scheduling problems that coaches must face, especially at the end of the competitive season. A clearing house to ensure that major tournaments do not conflict would be a step toward not only unifying the individual events community but the forensic community at large.

Chapter X
A View From Administrators

SCHOLARSHIP AND THE FORENSIC COMMUNITY

G. Thomas Goodnight

That all of us have gathered at the National Developmental Conference on Forensics, coming from many different schools and academic environments to discuss problems common to policy debate, values debate, and individual events indicates a strong, vital concern for the well-being of forensics. The work that we do here is important, for we represent a community that is far broader and deeper than often recognized. So compelling is the excitement of competition that most of us define the forensic community as to include only those who are presently performing and judging events; but, even after completing a career, when brief cases are put away, manuscripts shelved and ballots set aside, the alumni of forensics remain members of the community because the habits of mind created by participation in the activity remain for a lifetime. It is on behalf of this wider community that these comments are drawn. In particular, I wish to argue from the perspective of one who now works almost exclusively in the field of speech, a discipline which has given forensics its academic home and a discipline which is indebted to debate for much of its scholarly work.

In a meeting, held in conjunction with this Developmental Conference, a group of administrators decided to do something quite unusual for speech administrators; namely, to promulgate no rules, no regulations or procedures to save the activity. Rather, we operated from the assumption that forensic directors know best their own work. Still, we found a common concern, a problem that goes straight to the heart of the community itself, and that is the fragmentation encouraged by forensic feuds.

Perhaps it is fated for argument experts to argue endlessly over desirable goals and procedures, even to the point of conducting more than an occasional *auto da fe* in print. Some laud cognitive skills; some cleave to value development; still others tout vigorous expression. Disagreement is expected; at least since the time of the ancient Greeks, the education of youth has been controversial. What is alarming at present, however, is that tolerance for different opinions seems to be replaced with organizations at war, each attempting to advance partisan interests by specializing in a part of the activity. From policy debate to values debate to individual events to divisions within individual events, calls for membership are made by denigration and exclusion. Thus is the rancor in our literature transferred to divisiveness in professional meetings, and gradually the poison spreads to infect our own students.

Forensic factions find themselves mired in conflicts not unlike those of Attica's city-states. Recall the noble Greeks: proud, determined, forever at one another's throats. Always their orators extolled the virtuous and civilized traditions of their home cities; always, the others were held to be decadent and idolotrous. Never could their own commonalities become more important than their differences, even when the forces of barbarism were at the gate. To continue this latter day Philippic, it is not far from reality to imagine the forces of a new barbarism at the gates of humanistic inquiry. Certainly, forensics has a reason to unite.

The recent study of American higher education is making the startling discovery that the United States is losing ground in science and technology, and that this loss makes the nation less competitive with foreign countries. Unable to account for retreat, educational leaders have begun to doubt the single-minded pursuit of specialized training. Reports question the wisdom of compartmentalized learning without general thought, of technical training without appreciation of purpose, of refined technique without a concomitant discussion of responsible advocacy. Some experts, at least, are beginning to recognize that the liberal arts are a prerequisite to advance in the sciences.[1] But there is an even more fundamental problem, perhaps best articulated by James Billington of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars: "We are seeing a growing split between those who are morally concerned but not intellectually trained and those who are highly articulate but morally insensitive. That is very serious for democracy." He concludes, "It may not surive a full generation."[2] This problem is not new. It is well known to rhetorical theorists who find in Aristotle's pronouncement, that a specialized science cannot produce the principles to critique its own field, the justification for a transcendent method, argument.[3] To the extent forensics functions as argument, assembling the learning of specialized fields into cogent cases for prudent conduct, it provides the general method necessary to unite the specialities. Argumentation, of course, includes discursive elements as exemplified in disputation and non-discursive elements as enacted through interpretation of texts.

Ironically, while institutions of higher education stand upon the threshold of discovering the importance of the training forensics has always provided, forensic leaders are bent upon dismantling the wholistic approach once characteristic of the activity. Presently, students are encouraged to participate in values debate, policy debate, or individual interpretation—each exclusively, or, alternately, one at a time. The rationale for specialization is elusive. How can the study of policy be anything but empty unless the goals of the common weal be discussed and priorities resolved? How can the study of values be anything but impotent unless means for enactment are discovered and tested? And how can devotion to the arts of expression be anything but sentimentality or bombast when the student is not encouraged to ground feeling in value and reason? We have disciplines that specialize in logic, ethics, and the dramatic arts. Forensics works best and maintains its mission only when it addresses the whole person.

This ideal is not new. It is as old as the ideal of the good person speaking well. What is new is the context of the modern academy which devotes so much to time to assuring students they are but concatenations of blind forces and unconscious drives. Central to the humanistic enterprise is enlarging the scope of human freedom, and forensics—an activity which works upon reshaping human understanding through argument—stands within the citadel of free expression. By its tireless commitment to individual creation and evaluation, whether the speaking be that of a rank beginner or that of a well-versed veteran, forensics invites, even demands, that its participants create worlds of choice subject to human knowledge and responsibility. Whatever our preference for format, procedure, or event, surely these values unite us all.

The question of the moment is how to deal with the fragmentation of forensics. Simple proclamations of unity will not work, no matter how sincere the intent. The forensic wars have been long and exhausting. Wounds are deep. True, the work of this conference does represent a coming together. Yet, the community remains scattered. Scholars within the speech discipline, for example, are willing to believe claims of bad practice because they often see the activity through mists of time glittered by memory which bestowes character to their own participation, confirming that present events are unsalvageable. Perhaps all that can be accomplished now is to offer a definition of the essential characteristic of our community, a description which, if shared, will enable us, no matter what our convictions about accidental features, to recognize core concerns.

---

[1] Frank H. T. Rhodes, "The Role of the Liberal Arts in a Decade of Increased Technology," *Vital Speeches* 50 (June 15, 1984), 532-34; Mark H. Curtis, "Schools and the American Polity," *Vital Speeches* 50 (January 1, 1984), 190-92.

[2] "A Conversation with James Billington," *U.S. News & World Report* 97 (October 1, 1984), 70.

[3] See Aristotle's *Topics*. Richard McKeon, ed., *The Basic Works of Aristotle* (New York: Random House, 1941), 188-207.

Forensics is an expression of scholarship. The task of the forensic community is nothing less than the active, rigorous, on-going discovery, creation, interchange and critique of social knowledge. Social knowledge is the product of inter-disciplinary inquiry and the prerequisite to public deliberation. In this regard, forensic scholarship is not so much treating contests as the object of study as it is engaging participants in the cooperative process of study. Accordingly, forensics is not so much a kitchen in which ideas are confected by recipe to suit taste as it is a laboratory in which intense and systematic programs of investigation are undertaken. As scholarship, forensics fits within a tradition of learning through doing and reflecting.

Writing of the American scholar, Ralph Waldo Emerson worried about the stultifying results of social role. Immersed in the routine of craft, he thought, few contemplate purpose. "Thus, the priest becomes a form; the attorney, a statute book; the mechanic, a machine; the sailor, a rope of a ship." Society thus encourages a state "in which the members have suffered amputation from the trunk, and strut about so many walking monsters—a good finger, a neck, a stomach, an elbow, but never a man."[4] Scholars, too, can become immersed in the routine of transcribing thought, but Emerson's thinking person is encouraged to reflect, to see in action transcendent purpose. Forensics, understood as scholarship, holds this potential of movement from skills through criticism to reflective awareness of ideas.

Each forensic act encompasses as potential three orders of knowledge.[5] First, knowledge is exchanged concerning the development of technique. Judges often act as diagnosticians aiding the development of communication skills. Fellow participants, too, assist in the process by providing models for emulation or avoidance. At the second level, critical judgment must be mastered. Any speech is more than the collection of skills which gave it energy. Criticism evaluates the work against standards derived from a knowledge of the principles of good work within the traditions of rhetoric and public address. Participants, too, provide criticism, especially in debate, where cases are built, assaulted, and rebuilt. Sometimes the criticism is so far-reaching that a third level of knowledge is invoked questioning the advisability of standing theoretical positions. At this level, argumentation practice becomes an incubator of new insights into the communication process. Over the long run, as the debate community assimilates trends in public discourse and specialized thinking, theories of argumentation gradually emerge.

Occasionally, the scholarly nature of the activity is forgotten. For convenience the simple division of the world into those who think and those who teach is accepted. Forensic pedagogy is severed from forensic research. Yet, according to Emerson, scholarship is more than the preparation of manuscripts for lonely library shelves. It is the spirit and substance of creative critique and reflective understanding. In this light, forensics cannot be said to stand apart from the scholarly tradition. Unhampered by ideological commitment, methodological circumscription, or professional self-interest, forensics offers a unique laboratory in which the dialectic of public discourse can be creatively pursued.

Prior to the last Sedalia conference, such a definiton of forensics may not have been thinkable. Rieke and Brock, for example, follow a long standing prejudice when they separated studies in forensics and argumentation from those in public address and rhetoric. "The Forensics community appears to comprise a group of practitioners who lack an identifiable academic counterpart," they opine. "As a gulf has widened between the activity of forensics and the scholarly discipline of speech communication, the expected result would be (and has been) a diminution of scholarship by those in forensics and concomitant lessening of academic rejuvenation through research."[6] This observation has been long since outdated. Responding to Sillars and Zarefsky's timely call for an expansion of argumentation study through scholarship and teaching in forensics, new ground has been broken in the past decade.[7] Research continues apace into paradigms, public argument, political analysis, and much more. But there is a deeper issue here.

---

[4] Ralph Waldo Emerson, "The American Scholar," in *The Collected Works of Ralph Waldo Emerson* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1971), 53.

[5] On the issue of knowledge levels see G. Thomas Goodnight, "On the Re-Union of Argumentation and Debate," in *Dimensions of Argument: Proceedings of the Second Summer Conference on Argumentation* (Washington: Speech Communication Association, 1981), 415-432.

Rieke and Brock assume that argumentation and forensics are unrelated to the proud traditions of rhetoric and public address; that to study the latter is to abandon the former. This prejudice is without substantiation. However imperfect the enactment, forensics is made possible by the Anglo-American traditions of public address and free speech. It is an outgrowth of rhetorical practice, going back at least 2000 years. Indeed, the inter-relatedness of these studies can be directly observed when one considers the contribution forensic interest and training has made to present scholars of the speech field.

Consider just a few contemporary rhetorical theories. Rhetoric as epistemic, for instance, examines how arguments through choices structure reality. What could be a more fitting tribute to the world seen as a tournament writ large? Rhetoric and public knowledge offers an alternative avenue, one that draws attention to deliberative form enabling the refinement of public issue. Debate also influences scholars negatively. Fantasy theme analysis inverts forensics, partially, by celebrating collective and irrational elements of rhetoric, even while the theory, as a whole, is tied to the preservation of individual choice and initiative, keystone assumptions of forensics. Not all of these point in the same direction; nor may all prove to be sound. The point to be made is that forensics, however indirectly, has clearly contributed to the revitalization of thought concerning enduring rhetorics. That the speech communication community and the forensic community sometimes fail to see the productivity of relationship diminishes both.

If it can be agreed that forensics is essentially an expression of scholarship, and scholarship in the humanities itself a process of creating and testing knowledge, then perhaps some of the disciplinary boundaries can be removed. If the aim of forensics can again be the whole student—the person who must know, feel, and speak—then the rules and regulations, the formats and organizations which have preoccupied so much of our time and energy can be dismantled without rancor. It is time, perhaps even past the time that we demand of the leaders of this profession that they set aside past prejudice and personal animosity and work toward unification. If we argued as vigorously for the activity as we do against over-emphasizing one branch or another, think what could be accomplished. The first step is merely to recognize that advancing self-interest is not nearly as important as preserving the values we share in common.

---

[6] Richard D. Rieke and Bernard L. Brock, "Research and Scholarship in Forensics," in James McBath, ed., *Forensics as Communication: The Argumentative Perspective* (Skokie: Illinois: National Textbook Company, 1975), 130-131.

[7] Malcolm O. Sillars and David Zarefsky, "Future Goals and Roles of Forensics," in *Forensics as Communication: The Argumentative Process*, 83-100.

Appendix

NATIONAL DEVELOPMENTAL CONFERENCE ON FORENSICS

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Don Brownlee, California State Univeristy
K. Jeanine DiPaolo-Congalton, University of Utah
C.T. Hanson, North Dakota State University
Ed Hinck, University of Kansas
Michael P. Kelley, California State University
Ronald Matlon, University of Arizona
Thomas B. McClain, New Trier East High School
Donn W. Parson, University of Kansas
Ripple Rausch, Meridian Junior College
Jack Rhodes, Augustana College
Robert C. Rowland, Baylor University
Malcolm Sillars, University of Utah
Penny Swisher, William Jewell College
George Ziegelmueller, Wayne State University, Director

WORK GROUPS

TOPIC SELECTION

Kevin Baaske, University of Southern California
David Boman, Washburn University
Ralph Carbone, Butler University
Pat Ganer, Cypress College, Chair
Paul Gaske, San Diego State University
Ed Hollatz, Wheaton College
David Miller, Louisiana State University
Robert C. Rowland, Baylor University
David Thomas, University of Houston, Chair

PROMOTION AND TENURE

Kenneth Andersen, University of Illinois
K. Jeanine DiPaolo-Congalton, University of Utah
Craig Dudczak, University of Oklahoma, Chair
Isa Engleberg, Prince George's Community College
Steve Hunt, Lewis & Clark College
Karolyn Yocum, Central Missouri State University
Marilyn Young, Florida State University
David Zarefsky, Northwestern University, Chair

SUMMER INSTITUTES

Bill Balthrop, University of North Carolina, Chair
Robert Chandler, University of Kansas
Craig Cutbirth, Illinois State University

Adrian Frana, Rich East High School
David Hingstman, Baylor University, Chair
Allan Louden, University of Southern California
Thomas B. McClain, New Trier East High School
Larry Richardson, Western Washington University
Frank Sferra, Mullen High School

INCREASING THE EDUCATIONAL VALUE OF FORENSICS

Deborah Ballard-Reisch, St. Olaf College
Michael Bartanen, Pacific Lutheran University
James Cantrill, University of Illinois
Maridell Fryar, Midland Schools, Chair
John Gossett, North Texas State University
Tim Hynes, University of Louisville, Chair
Clark Olson, Arizona State University
Neil Phillips, University of Northern Iowa
Ripple Rausch, Meridian Junior College
Gregg Walker, University of Utah

ETHICS OF ADVOCACY

David Frank, University of Oregon
Carolyn Keefe, West Chester University
Randy Lake, University of Southern California
John Morello, James Madison University
Robin Reese, Central Missouri State University
Ross Smith, Wake Forest University
Ken Strange, Dartmouth College, Chair
Walter Ulrich, Vanderbilt University, Chair

RATIONAL FOR FORENSICS

Mike Bryant, Eastern Illinois University
William Harpine, University of Akron
Dale Herbeck, University of Iowa
Ed Hinck, University of Kansas
Brenda Logue, Towson State University
James McBath, University of Southern California, Chair
Thomas Miller, University of California—Los Angeles
Robert Rosenthal, Suffolk University, Chair
Darrell Scott, Gonzaga University

STRENGTHENING AND EXPANDING PROGRAMS

Sheryl Friedley, George Mason University
William Henderson, University of Northern Iowa
Thomas Hollihan, University of Southern California, Chair
Jack Kay, University of Nebraska, Chair
M. Jack Parker, Northern Illinois University
Donn W. Parson, University of Kansas
Don Swanson, University of Southern Colorado

EVALUATING INDIVIDUAL EVENTS

George Armstrong, Bradley University
Catherine Beaty, Parkersburg Community College, Chair
Kristine Davis-Bartanen, University of Puget Sound
David Dunlap, University of Iowa
C.T. Hanson, North Dakota State University
Suzanne Larson, Humboldt State University
Shawn McGee, Michigan Bell Telephone Company
John Murphy, University of Kansas
Sharon Porter, Northern Arizona University
Larry Schnoor, Mankato State University, Chair

INTER-ORGANIZATIONAL COOPERATION

Don Brownlee, California State University
Ed Harris, Suffolk University
Jack Rhodes, Augustana College
Malcolm Sillars, University of Utah, Chair
Penny Swisher, William Jewell College
Peg Taylor, Orange Coast College
David Waite, Butler University
Charles Willard, University of Louisville

ADMINISTRATORS

G. Thomas Goodnight, Northwestern University, Chair
James Klumpp, University of Nebraska
Donn W. Parson, University of Kansas
Gerald Sanders, Miami University
Joseph Wenzel, University of Illinois
Charles Willard, University of Louisville

REACTOR GROUP

John Bart, University of Kansas
David M. Berube, Weber State University
David C. Buckley, Southern Illinois University
Joyce Carey, University of Wisconsin—Eau Claire
Marlene Cohen, Prince George's Community College
Pam Cooper, Northwestern University
Steve Depoe, Emporia State University
Austin J.Freeley, John Carroll University
Kathleen M. Galvin, Northwestern University
Rex Gaskill, Normandale College
Phillip R. Gibson, University of Missouri—Kansas City
Robert W. Greenstreet, Graceland College
Bert Gross, Marshall University
Scott Harris, Northwestern University
David Huston, Dowling High School
Vicki L. Karns, Wayne State University
Arnie Madsen, Illinois State University

Vernon McGuire, Texas Tech University
John McKiernan, University of Iowa
Bill Newnam, Emory University
Kathleen Pamer, Wayne State University
Don Parker, Inver Hills Community College
J.W. Patterson, University of Kentucky
Christina L. Reynolds, University of Minnesota
Randy Richardson, Wayne State University
Kathryn Roberts, University of Alabama—Birmingham
Gerald Sanders, Miami University
Ed Schiappa, Northwestern University
Tim Sellnow, Wayne State University
Jim Springston, Wayne State University
Fred Sternhagen, Concordia College
Kevin Twohy, Carroll College
Ted Urban, Henry Ford Community College
Mike Wartman, Normandale Community College
Joseph Wenzel, University of Illinois
John Williams, Hoover High School